00028980

BOMBAY BRANCH

OF THE

# ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.

Digitized with financial assistance from

on 10 July, 2018

# THE STRENGTH OF ENGLAND

*BY THE SAME AUTHOR.*

THE STRENGTH OF NATIONS:

An Argument from History.

Crown 8vo. 5s. net.

---

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO. 39 Paternoster Row, London;
New York, Bombay, and Calcutta.

# THE STRENGTH OF ENGLAND

A POLITICO-ECONOMIC HISTORY OF ENGLAND
FROM SAXON TIMES TO
THE REIGN OF CHARLES THE FIRST

BY

J. W. WELSFORD, M.A.

FORMERLY FELLOW OF GONVILLE AND CAIUS COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE
AUTHOR OF 'THE STRENGTH OF NATIONS,' ETC.

28980 ac

WITH A PREFACE BY

W. CUNNINGHAM, D.D., F.B.A.

FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, AND ARCHDEACON OF ELY

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA
1910

*All rights reserved*

00028980

"This happy breed of men"

---

"Let us now praise famous men and our fathers that begat us."—Ecclesiasticus, xliv. i.

# PREFACE

A PATHETIC interest attaches to this book owing to the circumstances in which it was written; to his friends there is a melancholy satisfaction in feeling that the author's heroic struggle to carry on his work, through months of increasing illness, has been rewarded. He did not succeed in completing the task he had set himself; but he has left behind him a summary of English experience that ought to command the attention of all who are anxious for guidance in regard to the political issues of the present day. More than this, he has set many of the episodes of English history in a fresh light, so that no serious student of our political life in the past can afford to neglect this masterly sketch.

The essay has double importance because it is a valuable contribution to the economic interpretation of English political history. Other writers have been contented to treat the development of English resources and the changes in industrial and commercial organisation, as if they were a separate growth and as if political affairs could be left in the background;

but Mr. Welsford had a more statesmanlike view. He has recognised that political and economic changes are constantly reacting upon each other, and has set himself to show how deeply our political life has been influenced by economic forces and commercial conditions. The late Professor Thorold Rogers had called attention to the importance of this enquiry, but he had much to do in laying the foundations for the historical study of economics in this country by his monumental work on 'Agriculture and Prices,' and he could only make an occasional excursion into this field. Since his time historical students have been ready to recognise that economic forces were combined with other influences in bringing about such events as the Peasants' Revolt in 1381 or the Reform Bill of 1832. There must always be a danger, however, that attention will only be drawn to economic causes in a haphazard and occasional fashion, unless they are studied systematically, and their bearing is noted, not merely in violent upheavals, but in the ordinary course of life as well. This is the step Mr. Welsford has taken; he has examined the commercial relations of England—the dominant feature in the economic life of an island realm—and has endeavoured to show how changing commercial relationships affected the owners of English resources and the industrial population respectively. We are thus helped to understand how the economic interests of different classes in the community tended to bring about the formation of parties, and to influence their attitude in political

questions. The curious line of cleavage between the Scotsmen who opposed the claims of Edward I. and those who did not, and the persistence of the struggle for independence, become much more intelligible when the manner in which trading interests were affected is carefully taken into account.

Success in prosecuting this line of enquiry demands the highest qualities of the historian; it depends not merely on skill in testing and arranging the materials, but also on insight to interpret them. The study of history, as habitually prosecuted in this country, does not tend to the cultivation of this particular form of insight. The romantic and dramatic interest which attaches to the story of the past is always strong; but apart from this, the main motive for the serious study of English history has been that of discovering constitutional and legal precedents. The criticism of historical documents and the weighing of historical evidence have been carried on in a lawyer-like spirit, with the hope of obtaining the sort of proof that would satisfy a special jury. When we go behind the documents and ask why some commercial treaty was made at all, and why it embodies the provisions it contains, we enter on a field of enquiry where a complete proof can hardly be obtained. Consciously or unconsciously we argue from what we know of human motives in the present to probable conduct in the past. The actual motives at work have not been constantly recorded; we are forced to try to penetrate through the silence of chroniclers, by framing an

hypothesis and looking for any scraps of confirmatory evidence which help to verify it. Owing to the fact that there is not a mere uniformity, but progress, in the affairs of men, the conclusions of the historical investigator can never have such a high degree of certainty as those of the student of chemical science, who finds that his hypothesis is proved or disproved by actual experiment. Besides this, there is a serious danger that the hypothesis of the historian, though plausible, may be wholly inapplicable; the spirit of a bygone age was often so different from that of our own day that we cannot habituate ourselves to it intelligently or look at life from the point of view of contemporaries. There has, indeed, been a great change in religious and political sentiment since the Middle Ages, but the difficulty is not so great in regard to commercial life. We cannot doubt that the force of economic interest, as we know it, has been a *vera causa* in the political changes of bygone times; material needs can never have been wholly overlooked. In so far as buying and selling and opportunities for exchange had come into vogue among any people, the interests at work were doubtless similar to those which operate at the present day, though the conditions may have been wholly different. It can never be easy to take such account of the conditions as to recognise in retrospect what were the precise interests, immediate or ultimate, of any class of the people in any particular part of the country; it may be still more difficult to see how far they were conscious of these interests and had a

definite policy. But as our knowledge of the past accumulates, the possibility of giving a well-founded answer to such questions will be increased. The present essay does not pretend to say the last word on any of the questions which the author has raised; the main importance of his achievement lies in the skill with which he has pointed out a fruitful line of investigation for other students to follow, so that our knowledge of the economic factor in the political life of bygone ages may become more and more complete.

Owing to the point of view which he has taken, the author has avoided two dangers which beset the writer of English history; his treatment of the subject is neither merely insular, nor unduly antiquarian. The constitutional lawyer has but little need to look beyond the shores of England; he may find an extraneous interest in noting analogies with changes in other lands, but they do not come directly within his purview. On the other hand, the student of commercial relationships is closely concerned with the intercourse between England and other lands; he is compelled to look at this realm as a part of the great world, and as affected by the conditions of life in other countries. So far as the internal economic history is concerned, the discussion of the organisation of the manor and the powers of craft gilds appears to be mere antiquarianism—an unearthing of curious relics from the past. But so far as commerce is concerned, there are close parallels between the story of England in the Middle Ages and the accounts we get of the conditions

of rich but undeveloped lands at the present time. It is a great thing to bring the past into relation with our own actual experience; nothing renders history more vivid than an indication that the forces with which we are familiar in the present were actively operative in the past.

In so far as the gulf between the past and the present is thus bridged, we can obtain valuable guidance from experience in regard to many of the problems which lie before us. Experience is so dearly purchased that the lessons it teaches ought to be highly prized. An inestimable service is rendered by anyone who calls attention to the heritage of economic experience which is stored up for us in the history of our country, and enables us to see how we can draw upon it—not to settle our difficulties for us, but to help us to deal with them in the wisest way.

A conviction that an accurate knowledge of the conditions of the past was necessary for a right understanding of the problems of the present was one of the striking features of Arnold Toynbee's 'Lectures on the Industrial Revolution.' Instructive as that book has been, it was a bitter disappointment to those who had known him well, to realise how little of his accurate learning had been put on record and saved from oblivion. There must be the same pathetic sense of regret in reading Mr. Welsford's book on 'The Strength of England'; he had read so widely and so intelligently. He had collected materials in regard to struggles for the control of the great trade routes of

Europe; but much of this was deliberately laid on one side in order that the attention of readers might be concentrated on points where English interests were concerned. It is more unfortunate that we should be deprived of his full treatment of the seventeenth century, when England had come to be fully conscious of her strength, and the great era of expansion began. He was not even able to revise his manuscript for press, and to insert definite references to his authorities. But we prize what is left us all the more because we cannot forget that so much has been lost.

W. CUNNINGHAM.

TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE:
*December* 22, 1909.

# INTRODUCTORY

THIS royal throne of kings, this scepter'd isle,
This earth of majesty, this seat of Mars,
This other Eden, demi-paradise ;
This fortress built by Nature for herself
Against infection and the hand of war ;
This happy breed of men, this little world ;
This precious stone set in the silver sea,
Which serves it in the office of a wall
Or as a moat defensive to a house,
Against the envy of less happier lands ;
This blesséd plot, this earth, this realm, this England,
This nurse, this teeming womb of royal Kings,
Fear'd by their breed, and famous by their birth,
Renowned for their deeds as far from home—
For Christian service and true chivalry—
As is the sepulchre, in stubborn Jewry,
Of the world's ransom, blessed Mary's Son ;
This land of such dear souls, this dear dear land,
Dear for her reputation through the world,
Is now leas'd out—I die pronouncing it—
Like to a tenement, or pelting farm ;

England, bound in with the triumphant sea,
Whose rocky shore beats back the envious siege
Of watery Neptune, 's now bound in with shame,
With inky blots, and rotten parchment bonds :
That England, that was wont to conquer others,
Hath made a shameful conquest of itself.

*King Richard II.*, Act ii. Scene 1.

# CONTENTS


| CHAP. | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| I. | THE ROMAN SETTLEMENT | 1 |
| II. | THE SETTLEMENT OF EUROPE | 8 |
| III. | SAXON ENGLAND | 22 |
| IV. | THE COMING OF THE NORMAN | 34 |
| V. | NORMAN AND ENGLISH | 55 |
| VI. | BECKET'S FIGHT FOR ENGLISH FREEDOM | 71 |
| VII. | ENGLAND ACQUIRES NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE | 79 |
| VIII. | THE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE ASSERTED BY A PROTECTIONIST | 91 |
| IX. | THE MAGNATES LOSE THEIR DEMOCRATIC SYMPATHIES. | 107 |
| X. | CARTA MERCATORIA AND ITS INFLUENCE. | 121 |
| XI. | ENGLAND LOSES SEA POWER | 136 |
| XII. | STRIFE BETWEEN KING AND BARONS | 150 |
| XIII. | CAUSES WHICH LED TO THE WAR OF THE ROSES | 165 |
| XIV. | THE WAR OF THE ROSES | 179 |
| XV. | ENGLAND'S PROTECTIVE POLICY INITIATED | 193 |
| XVI. | SPAIN ENTERS INTO TRADE COMPETITION | 205 |
| XVII. | SUPPRESSION OF THE MONASTERIES | 219 |
| XVIII. | ENGLAND FREES HERSELF FROM PAPAL SUPREMACY | 233 |
| XIX. | INCREASE OF ENGLAND'S NAVAL POWER | 246 |
| XX. | THE ARMADA. ENGLISH AND DUTCH OBTAIN CONTROL OF THE SEA | 260 |

| CHAP. | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| XXI. | TRADE RIVALRY BETWEEN ENGLISH AND DUTCH. . | 273 |
| XXII. | RELIGIOUS CONTENTIONS IN ENGLAND AND HER COLONIES . . . . . | 287 |
| XXIII. | CAUSES WHICH LED TO CIVIL WAR . . . . . | 301 |
| XXIV. | CONDITION OF THE PEOPLE UNDER CHARLES I. . . | 316 |
| XXV. | THE POLICY OF ARCHBISHOP LAUD . . . . . | 330 |
| XXVI. | KING CHARLES I. AND HIS EARLS . . . . . | 344 |
| | ENVOI . . . . . | 351 |
| | LIST OF WORKS CONSULTED . . . . . | 353 |
| | INDEX . . . . . | 357 |

# THE STRENGTH OF ENGLAND

## I

## HOW THE GOLDEN FLEECE CAME TO ENGLAND

### THE ROMAN SETTLEMENT

55 B.C.–449 A.D.

STUDENTS of Carlyle's writings are familiar with Dr. Dryasdust, the historian who took infinite pains to examine the records of the past. It is curiously characteristic of the middle of last century that such historians, whose work is of the utmost value, should have been considered fit objects for scorn and derision. It was, however, perhaps natural that England should have adopted this attitude towards patient seekers after truth when she was not ashamed to greet Darwin's discoveries with a torrent of ridicule, inspired by superstitious fear.

The earliest historians were men after Carlyle's own heart. Unfettered by musty documents, they recited or sang to royal listeners the deeds of heroes who founded the line of kings. The tale they told had to be consistent with such facts as came within

the knowledge of their hearers; but this was the only restriction imposed upon the bards. Thus, when they told the Greeks the story of the voyage of the Argonauts to Colchis on the shores of the Black Sea, the listeners accepted the tale in spite of its miraculous incidents. It was the same tale they had heard in the nursery from their parents; and it explained the existence of the great trade route to the East by way of the Black Sea.

So many thousand years have elapsed since the legend of the Quest of the Golden Fleece was originally told that it is impossible to say what the Golden Fleece at first meant to the Greeks. Some have conjectured that the Golden Fleece was actual gold found in the streams of Colchis; but since no Dryasdust is at hand to guide the seeker after truth, the guess may be hazarded that the Argonauts brought back an improved breed of sheep to be fed on the fields of Thessaly, or perhaps a wise Medea returned with the Argonauts to teach a better way of weaving cloth. For wool was golden before cotton became king.

Long after the immediate results which had come from Jason's voyage were forgotten, the legend continued to fascinate the Greek mind, because it seemed to account for the Black Sea trade with the East, which for thousands of years enriched the whole Balkan peninsula. For much the same reason the Greeks were never tired of telling the story of the fall of Troy, the city which commanded the entrance to the Black Sea, as Byzantium, or Constantinople, for thousands of years after the fall of Troy, stood sentinel over the Bosphorus.

The Arthurian legends, which tell the story of part of England's infancy, were written thousands of years later than the Greek legends. The voyage of the Argonauts and the siege of Troy are descriptions of the attacks made by a less civilised race upon richer and more firmly established Powers; the story of Arthur is the record of a gallant struggle made by a weak people to keep their treasure from strong invaders. The treasure which the Anglo-Saxon Argonauts sought in England was a Golden Fleece. They saw that England was a pleasant land with fields of corn, flocks of sheep, herds of cattle, rich mines, and well-built, even luxurious, houses. They found that this wealth was in the hands of men who were so barbarous that they had not learned to write their history. The explanation of this anomalous condition is the first portion of the history of England.

About the middle of the century which preceded the birth of Christ, Caesar, having apparently conquered Gaul, determined to compel the kinsfolk of the Gauls who lived in Britain to submit to the rule of Rome. In 55 B.C. and again in 54 B.C. Caesar invaded Britain, only to find that there was no Golden Fleece or anything else worth taking. "Of all the natives, far the most civilised are those who inhabit the district of Kent, which is all situated on the coast; nor do these differ greatly in their manners from the inhabitants of Gaul. Those who live farther inland sow no corn, but live on milk and flesh, and are clothed in skins." This was Caesar's description, and Cicero wrote: "We already know that there is not an ounce of silver in that island nor any hope of booty except

slaves, among whom I do not think you will expect to find any skilled in literature or music."

For seventy-nine years the poverty of the island was its protection from Roman invaders. Thrice the Emperor Augustus contemplated the conquest of Britain; but he decided that, by levying customs duties on the trade between Britain and the Continent, he could extract as much tribute from the island as could be extorted after a successful invasion. It is a curious coincidence that the foreigner to-day shares the view of the Roman of two thousand years ago, that when the British fail to reply to Continental tariffs, these Continental customs duties are equivalent to a tribute paid by Britain. The British meekly paid the tribute until the time came when the Romans were prepared to invade their island.

In 43 A.D., during the reign of the Emperor Claudius, the Romans again invaded Britain; and this time they came to stay. Slowly but surely they overcame the resistance of the British, and about 120 A.D., under the Emperor Hadrian, they built their first wall from the Tyne to the Firth of Solway. Forty years later the lowlands of Scotland were a Roman province, and a second wall was built between the Firths of Forth and of Clyde. For nearly three centuries Rome ruled Britain and many of Rome's greatest emperors learned the art of war in this turbulent province. Thus Constantine the Great left his father's death-bed at York to assume the purple and move the centre of Empire from Rome to Byzantium; and Theodosius the Great, who definitely established the supremacy of Christianity and of Constantinople, owed his imperial

title to the fame his father had gained in wars with the British.

During three centuries Rome did in Britain the work which Britons are now doing in barbarous lands. They found an undeveloped country, whose inhabitants sacrificed human beings to their gods, and who, according to Caesar's statement, practised a system of polyandry similar to that which at present exists in Tibet. In this barbarous island the Romans built cities and made roads which have been preserved for nearly two thousand years. They introduced domestic animals and useful plants and trees. Instead of a narrow fringe of cultivation round the coast, the whole island was so thoroughly tilled that on one occasion eight hundred vessels were sent to Britain to procure corn for the Roman cities in Germany. From time to time English ploughmen unearth the foundations of the luxurious Roman villas which at one time must have been so conspicuous a feature in Britain. Rome brought the Golden Fleece to Britain.

The transformation of Britain is well illustrated in the town of Bath, the old Roman Aquae Sulis. To this town the wealthy went in search of health or pleasure, and there the great bath was placed in a hall 111 feet 4 inches long by 66 feet 6 inches wide. The bath was 6 feet 8 inches deep, and its bottom measured 73 feet 2 inches by 29 feet 6 inches. "The still existing masonry and lead work show how large and costly was the actual bathing institution." So luxurious a health resort is only possible in a wealthy country. But this prosperity and luxury were exotic growths, and they vanished when Rome's fiscal policy destroyed the

metropolis of the Empire. Britain was merely a Roman province, and her production was stimulated and forced in order to feed the idle citizens in Rome.

The untamed Britons were driven into the mountains of Wales or beyond the great wall. The tamed Britons tilled the fields, worked in the mines, and built the baths, towns and villas. The Roman saw that the work was done: the Briton did the work. Some Britons amalgamated with their conquerors and became masters instead of serfs; but the mass of the population remained in a servile condition, mere hewers of wood and drawers of water. The tamed Britons were disarmed, and the island was kept in subjection by legions drawn from other parts of the Empire. Britons who became soldiers were sent to distant provinces where patriotism would not tempt them to be disloyal to Rome.

In 383 a general in Britain, Maximus, "was almost against his will declared Emperor by the army." He united Britain, Gaul and Spain in a great Western Empire, and would have anticipated Charles the Great by making Rome its metropolis, had he not been defeated by Theodosius the Great. To carry out this ambitious scheme Britain was denuded of its Roman legions and these were never fully replaced. In 407 the Roman army in Britain raised a private soldier, Constantine, to the purple, and followed him to Gaul. From this date the island appears to have been undefended by the legions of Rome.

Rome had now too many sorrows to be able to attend to the affairs of a distant province. For centuries the Empire had been maintaining the line of

the Rhine and the Danube against the nomadic tribes who pressed in from the East. Of these some, the Angles, Jutes and Saxons, had drifted into Northern Germany and Frisia, where they could find some pasturage for their flocks; others had migrated northwards to the Scandinavian lands, where they were forced to find other means of subsistence than the keeping of flocks and herds. From the sea, by fair means or foul, by fishing and trading or by plundering others, the Danes and Northmen drew their livelihood.

As the pressure from the East increased and the strength of Rome decayed, the Roman barrier was broken, and Goths, Huns and Slavs poured into the Empire. The civilisation of Rome was submerged beneath this influx of barbarians. This is why, in the fifth century, when the legions were drawn from Britain, they went never to return. The Romanised Britons who were left behind were a feeble folk. Their wealth was great but their strength was little. They were too weak to resist their neighbours in Wales and beyond the wall. In 446 they are represented as making a pitiful appeal to Rome. "The barbarians drive us to the sea: the sea drives us back upon the barbarians." This appeal may or may not have been made, but in any case no answering legions came from Rome. In 449 Vortigern invited the Angles to come to Britain to preserve his feeble subjects from the Picts.

## II

### THE SETTLEMENT OF EUROPE

### 476–843

THE Angles, who were invited by Vortigern, found a rich island inhabited by a weak people. Their kinsfolk across the sea learned the good news and continued their pilgrimage towards the West. The invasion of Britain was merely an incident in that movement of barbarian tribes which, during the fifth century, broke through Rome's barriers and enabled wandering herdsmen to pasture their flocks over the Western Empire. The coming of the Anglo-Saxons to Britain destroyed every link between the island and Rome. The land which the Romans had transformed into a granary was described by inland Europeans as a dim mysterious island whose fishermen visited the coasts of Gaul to carry back with them the souls of the dead to their shadow isle.

In the fighting which accompanied the Anglo-Saxon invasion the towns which the Romans had built were utterly destroyed. The invaders were herdsmen, not dwellers in towns, and they destroyed all places which could serve as shelters for their enemies. Nevertheless, contact with Roman civilisation affected the Anglo-Saxons. They ceased to

wander and began to farm the land. Saxon vills replaced the villae in which Roman rulers had lived and from which they controlled the cultivators of their estates. In time the Saxon vills became the old English manors, and later on English villages. When Anglo-Saxons abandoned their nomadic life they had a far larger supply of grain; but, against this advantage, there was the difficulty of keeping their flocks and herds during the winter on their more limited pastures. This difficulty was partly met by killing sheep and cattle in the autumn and salting their flesh.

Owing to the absence of documentary evidence the early constitution and development of the Anglo-Saxon vills is a much debated question. It is, however, known that they became almost self-contained communities, ruled by Lords of the Manor whose private lands or demesnes were cultivated for them by their dependents. Under these rulers there were villeins, holding about thirty acres of land on an average and owning oxen and ploughs, cotters with smaller holdings, and slaves. There were few slaves, except in the West; and absolute slavery disappeared in the eleventh century. Beyond the village fields there were waste lands on which the cattle and sheep grazed. These wastes have a romantic interest for Englishmen, since on the wool of the sheep they fed England's greatness was founded. The simple wants of the dwellers in these vills were for the most part supplied by their own labour. Two articles, however, had to be imported—salt, which they consumed and used to preserve meat for winter use, and iron for their weapons and ploughs. To pay for these they had the hides of

their slaughtered animals and wool. These articles which each vill sold in early times were for centuries also the chief export from England to the Continent.

For two hundred years England was isolated from the civilisation of Europe. Nearly a century before this isolation began the Emperor Constantine had made Constantinople the metropolis of the Roman Empire. Three years after the departure of the Roman legions from Britain, Rome was sacked by the Goths. The provinces of the Empire were overrun by barbarian tribes, and it seemed as if Rome was destined to share the fate of Babylon and other imperial centres, which had for a while reigned supreme and then perished utterly. Yet there were some whose faith in Rome was not destroyed. One of her poets wrote that "Rome would rise again as the lawgiver of the ages; she alone need not fear the web of the Fates; to her all countries would again pay tribute; her harbours would once more be filled with the spoils of the barbarian; for her the Rhineland would ever be tilled, and the Nile overflow; Africa would provide her with abundant harvests, and even the Tiber, crowned as a conqueror with bulrushes, would bear Roman fleets upon his waves." Had the Crusades succeeded this prophecy would have been entirely fulfilled. It was a true forecast of the future of Europe, though not of Africa.

Nationality and patriotism were conceptions beyond the intellects of Europeans at the time of Rome's fall. Wandering herdsmen had doubtless tribal feeling, but they could not have understood the meaning of love of the land in which they settled. The conquered pro-

vincials had been taught to look towards Rome. Hence when victors and vanquished intermarried the people had but a vague feeling of patriotism. Where one great wave of conquest rolled over a province the petty chieftains might acknowledge one overlord; but where the conquest was gradual, as in England, even this sentimental bond of union was lacking. The feudal system grew naturally from this beginning. The need of union for offence or defence in case of an attack was recognised from the first, but the higher conception of economic union was too subtle for undeveloped minds. The bond of union was found in religion. The invaders in the South embraced Arian Christianity, a form which separated them from the Trinitarians of Rome and Byzantium. In the North and in England they adhered to their pagan creed. The octroi paid at the gates of some continental cities is a survival from the time when portions of a community could frame their own fiscal system, whilst divergence from the national Church was treated as treason.

Imperial Rome had grown by destroying primitive nationality, and absorbing in her cosmopolitan system the peoples she conquered. Her provinces were forced to produce in order that the dwellers in Rome might live in idleness. The world learned that it was impossible to resist her all-conquering legions, and seemed to acquiesce in her rule. But economic forces are stronger than armies. From the time of Solomon the Jews and Greeks had been the international traders of the old world. These traders found a bond of union in Christianity. "The Greek Church had grown to be

almost equal in power to the Roman State before Constantine determined to unite the two in strict alliance." When Byzantium became Constantinople, military strength fled from Rome and the Western Empire was lost to the barbarians. Rome had, however, one great advantage over her conquerors. In her was stored the traditionary wisdom of the past; and in time her superior knowledge triumphed over all obstacles.

The ancient boundaries of the Roman Empire were the Rhine and the Danube. Britain was a later acquisition. The barbarians who settled within the ancient boundaries were largely affected by the civilisation of the peoples with whom they mingled. Christianity was spreading throughout the Empire just before its fall. Many of the barbarian invaders on the Continent accepted Christianity, whilst the Anglo-Saxons remained pagan. The Christian Churches in Wales and Ireland were as independent of Rome as the Church of England is to-day; and this independence was shared by the Arian Churches in the Gothic kingdoms formed from the Roman provinces. In Rome itself the Bishop succeeded to the power of the Senate, and became the largest landowner in Italy. As Pope he distributed food to the idle citizens as their emperors had done. But St. Peter's patrimony was none too large for the hungry mouths in Rome; hence the Popes were forced to aim at regaining Rome's former power of levying tribute on Europe.

The turning point in Rome's fortune came in 496 when Clovis, a pagan Frankish princelet who was

forming a Frankish Empire, was converted to the orthodox Roman form of Christianity. The Pope regained the lost legions of the Empire, and the Frank had at his service the wisdom of ancient Rome. Before the death of Clovis in 511 the larger part of the lands between the Atlantic and the Rhine acknowledged the temporal sovereignty of the Frankish King and the spiritual dominion of the Pope. During the sixth century Rome achieved a still greater success. The religious enthusiasm of isolated monks and hermits was utilised. In accordance with the teaching of St. Benedict monks were bidden to dwell together in monasteries and devote their lives to useful work—agriculture, industry, or study. The Benedictines so increased the productiveness of the lands in which they settled that they were welcomed by both Catholic Frank and Arian Goth. Their influence changed the Arians of Spain into fervent Catholics before the end of the sixth century. As missionaries they penetrated into pagan lands and paved a way for the Frankish warriors. The Rhine was once more Rome's boundary, and, eager for new lands to conquer, in 597 St. Augustine, with a little band of monks, sailed across the Channel to bring Saxon pagans and British Christians into the Roman fold.

During the sixth century an Irish missionary, St. Columba, had founded a mission station in Iona, and the dwellers in Scotland were learning the Christian faith from teachers who were not connected with Rome. Surrounded by Christian neighbours a national church might have been created had the Anglo-Saxons accepted Christianity from their fellow-

countrymen. Instead of listening to their teaching, Ethelfrid, King of Northumbria, inflicted a crushing defeat on Aidan, King of the Scots, in 603, and, at a later date, attacked and routed the Christian Welsh at Chester. Before their defeat at Chester St. Augustine had met the Welsh bishops in conference. He had urged them to abandon the British ritual and accept the supremacy of Rome. When the bishops refused St. Augustine warned them that "if Welshmen would not be kith and kin (sibbe) with us, they should by Saxon hands perish." This prophecy was supposed to have been fulfilled when the Welsh were slaughtered at Chester.

The rapid success of St. Augustine, after his landing in Thanet, was probably due to the influence of the wife of the King of Kent. She was a daughter of the Frankish king, and must have been familiar with the civilisation which Benedictines brought with them. Adherence to paganism would have kept the Anglo-Saxons in communion with their kinsfolk in the north; acceptance of British Christianity might have led to insular union; but close intercourse with the civilisation of Rome was only to be gained by accepting the teaching of St. Augustine. The defeat of the pagan English at Winwaed in 654 secured the triumph of Christianity. By this time the Northumbrians had accepted that form of Christianity which their Irish neighbours professed. Ten years after the battle of Winwaed a conference was held at Whitby at which the Northumbrians decided to accept the ritual of Rome. For some time the old faith lingered in Scotland, but ultimately Great Britain acknow-

ledged Rome's supremacy in religion, whilst the Irish retained the faith of their fathers.

St. Wilfrid was the champion of Rome at the Whitby conference, and his life is instructive to those who wish to understand the condition of England in the seventh century. Educated by Irish monks, St. Wilfrid, at the age of seventeen, went on pilgrimage to Rome. At the age of twenty-six he was appointed Abbot of Ripon, and at once expelled the monks as Irish schismatics. This act led to the conference which ended in a triumph for Rome. Wilfrid was then appointed Bishop of York, and obtained permission to go to the Continent where he could be consecrated by bishops whose orthodoxy was unimpeachable. During Wilfrid's absence his opponents filled the see of York with a bishop who was consecrated in England. At this time the see of Canterbury was vacant, and the Pope consecrated a Greek, Theodore of Tarsus, Archbishop of Canterbury. Theodore installed Wilfrid at York and compensated the intruding bishop by reconsecrating him and giving him the see of Mercia. Half-pagan, ignorant kings were not able to contend with Roman ecclesiastics, who were armed with the strength which knowledge gives.

The rapidity with which wealth was created by the Benedictines soon made the Bishop of York, with his Abbeys in Ripon and Hexham, a power in the land. Both Wilfrid's King and Archbishop Theodore began to fear a rival whose authority threatened to overshadow their own. Wilfrid was deposed by the Archbishop, and hurriedly left England to carry an appeal to Rome. Landing on the coast of Holland,

Wilfrid spent some time in preaching to the Saxons of Frisia. He was the first of a line of English missionaries who preached Christianity to the Saxons across the sea, and thus paved the way for their absorption in the Frankish Empire and subjection to the power of Rome. Wilfrid returned to England with papal letters annulling his deposition. These letters were treated as invalid on the plea of their having been obtained by bribery. After nine months' imprisonment Wilfrid was forced to seek refuge in Sussex amongst the only pagan Saxons who survived in England. During his exile Wilfrid completed the conversion of England by bringing his hosts into the Christian fold.

The death of the King of Northumbria enabled Wilfrid to spend the last years of his life in the home of his boyhood. He died rich as befitted the Abbot of Ripon and Hexham, and left a quarter of his wealth to Rome. Had the money Rome drew from England been confined to such voluntary gifts, little objection could be made. If monks received large gifts of land from English kings, they could make the land more productive than their lay neighbours, and the wisdom of the monks came from Rome. But when ecclesiastics claimed exemption from national taxation and left the burden of defending England to the laity whilst they took the tenth part of England's production for the Church, and when, in the eighth century, Rome succeeded in re-establishing the ancient tribute under the new name of Peter's Pence, there was little economic difference between the new papal and old imperial rule. The emperors, like the popes,

gave civilisation to England; both imparted the wisdom of Rome and increased English production; and both levied tribute. In time papal Rome drew from England a larger revenue than the king could collect.

During the seventh century the monasteries were tightening their hold over the land and agricultural production of Europe, which was becoming a land like Tibet where the monks have annihilated the secular power. England was divided into petty kingdoms, whilst the Catholic kings of France and Spain were mere puppets in the hands of ecclesiastics. The shock of the Saracenic invasion saved Europe. A movement of Arabian tribes developed into a force which tore Asiatic and African provinces from the Eastern Empire, overspread Spain, and threatened to absorb Western Christendom. The revival of the military power of the Franks was necessary for the defence of Rome's ecclesiastical system. Under Charles Martel a Christian army, in 732, defeated the Saracens near the monastery of Tours and preserved both Europe and Christianity from the invader. A few years before the battle of Tours the Mahomedans were defeated in their attempt to seize Constantinople. Christians and Mahomedans learned that neither creed could absorb the other, and sullenly acquiesced in a division of the shores of the Mediterranean. The international middlemen of the ancient world, the Jews, basked in the sunshine of prosperity when they were able to monopolise trade between the followers of Christ and those of Mahomed.

After the victory of Tours the Pope had still need

of Frankish soldiers. The Saxons in Northern Europe were pagans and therefore paid nothing to Rome. One branch of the Saxons had migrated to the plains of Lombardy. Like their brethren in England the Lombards accepted the creed of Rome; but the Lombard king and the Pope put forward rival claims to sovereignty over Italy. A forged document, the Donation of Constantine, was used by the Popes as the foundation for their claim to compel Italians to feed the idle citizens of Rome as they had done when Rome was the centre of a world empire.

English missionaries played almost as important a part as Frankish soldiers in bringing Saxons into the Roman fold. An Englishman, Willibrord, followed Wilfrid as missionary to the Saxons in the Low Countries, and became Bishop of Utrecht. Then the army of Charles Martel added the Netherlands to the Frankish Empire. Wynfrith of Crediton, better known as St. Boniface, carried the Christian faith into the heart of Germany. Supported by the soldiers of Charles Martel, he desecrated the groves in which Germans met for their religious rites and hewed down their sacred oaks. St. Boniface survived Charles Martel, and, in the reign of his son, Pipin, became Patriarch of the Franks. Pipin's reign was mainly occupied in defeating the Lombards and founding the temporal power of the Pope in Italy. The labours of Charles Martel and Pipin were brought to a triumphant conclusion by Pipin's son, Charles the Great, whose confidential friend and adviser was Alcuin, an English monk. Thus the English devoted their best and wisest to the service of foreigners, whilst

England was distracted by incessant civil wars, caused by the absence of a central government.

In 772 Charles the Great led a great army against the Saxons of Northern Germany. He advanced accompanied not only by " Frankish soldiers, but by bishops, abbots and presbyters—a numerous train of the tonsured ones." Thus commenced a war which lasted thirty-two years and ended in the complete defeat of the Saxons. The trees and groves which the Saxons held sacred were destroyed, and those Saxons who would not abandon their religion and race were forced, with their chieftain, Widukind, to seek refuge in Denmark. In 782 Charles thought that fire and sword had done their work so thoroughly that it was safe to promulgate a law punishing with death Saxons who failed to obey the rules of the Catholic Church or hid in order to escape baptism. Widukind then returned and the Saxons rose in rebellion. In the merciless campaign which followed, Charles massacred 4500 Saxon prisoners by the banks of the Aller. In 785 Widukind submitted and was baptised.

In 799 Charles transported Saxons to distant parts of his empire, and repeopled Saxonia with Franks. When the Saxons were completely subdued Charles attacked the Danes, but after a short campaign this new missionary enterprise was happily ended by a peace in 810.

In the intervals between his Saxon campaigns Charles completed the destruction of the Lombard kingdom, and endowed the Pope with land. In return he was, in 800, crowned Emperor by the Pope. It is recorded that Charles did not seek this honour but

was surprised into allowing the ceremony to be performed. The coronation was an assertion of Rome's right to grant what had been won by the sword. The long struggle between ecclesiastic and temporal rule over Europe dates from the coronation of Charles the Great. This contest was reproduced in miniature in every country in the West of Europe. Charles's son, Louis the Pious, was crowned by his father without any reference to Rome; but, after the death of Charles, Louis undid the work of his father by submitting to the Pope. The civil wars of Louis' reign weakened the Frankish Empire. There was great slaughter in the battle which preceded the Treaty of Verdun in 843. The Frankish army was destroyed and the empire permanently divided.

Like Napoleon, Charles the Great was more successful in extending his empire than in carrying out his commercial designs. When he tried to seize Venice, the gate through which Eastern products entered Europe from Constantinople, a Byzantine fleet sailed up the Adriatic and Venice retained her independence. The attempt to open up a trade route to the East by way of the Danube also failed. The commanding position of the Jews in the commercial world is shown by Charles' choice of a Jew as his ambassador to the court of Caliph Haroun al Raschid at Bagdad. West of the Caspian there was a Jewish colony in the eighth century. It is even supposed that the Khazars, who lived in that region, embraced Judaism. These Jews were able to facilitate commerce between the East and Wisby on the island of Gothland, the commercial centre of the Scandinavians

The extent and character of the trade which passed up the long Russian rivers to the Baltic is proved by the finding in Gothland of German, Hungarian, and Anglo-Saxon coins, together with Arabian coins issued by eleven different Caliphs. The Scandinavians were beginning that career which made them masters of Normandy, Sicily, and England, which led them to discover America, and all but gave them Constantinople, the commercial metropolis of the European world. For two centuries England and Western Europe paid dearly for Charles' attempt to add this trade route to his possessions by conquering the Danes.

## III

### SAXON ENGLAND

779–1016

DURING the reign of Charles the Great, Offa, King of Mercia, established a sort of supremacy over the other English kings. Alcuin, the English monk who advised Charles the Great, was probably the mediator who smoothed over the one commercial quarrel which disturbed the otherwise peaceful relations between England and Frankland. Small duties on imports and exports were levied in the Frankish Empire as they had been in the days of imperial Rome. In England, also, prises, or small portions of the cargoes of incoming and outgoing ships, were taken at the ports in return for the king's peace which traders enjoyed. Like modern English customs they were levied for revenue. The idea of protecting the work of the poor was a much later conception. Pilgrimages to Rome were popular in England, and traders "under the guise of holiness transacted a profitable business in the transport of specie and merchandise." These English merchant-pilgrims evaded Charles' duties; he therefore forbade all intercourse with England, and England replied to these old-world Berlin Decrees by primitive Orders in Council. A compromise was

ultimately arranged by which *bona-fide* English pilgrims were exempted from tolls, whilst Charles reserved the right of levying duties on impostors.

Alcuin, to whose counsel the compromise is attributed, gave Charles excellent advice during the Saxon wars. The Emperor was urged to purify Rome and to deal gently with the conquered Saxons; in particular, to abstain from exacting tithes from these recent converts. This advice was not followed, and the Danes made use of their sea power to deliver a counter-attack when Charles threatened to destroy their homes and their faith. Whilst the Frankish Empire was united, its fleet was able to preserve Frankland and England from actual invasion; but the Northmen established themselves in neighbouring islands and attacked the coasts. After the Treaty of Verdun in 843, which definitely divided the Frankish Empire, the Normans began to invade Frankland and England.

In the "Anglo-Saxon Chronicle" it is written that, probably about 790, "first came three ships of Northmen. And then the reeve rode thereto and would fain drive them to the king's vill, for he knew not what they were, and there they slew him." The reeve wished either to collect the customary prise or to learn the king's wishes with regard to these strange visitors. The Northmen found the English Saxons very unlike their allies whom Charles the Great had been slaughtering at the Aller. Monks, priests, and Christian buildings proved that the English were in close touch with the Franks. When they returned to their homes the Northmen told their neighbours that vengeance could be wreaked on Christian foes, and a rich reward

was awaiting those who would attack England. In 793 the Northmen destroyed the monastery of Lindisfarne and sailed away with their booty.

The Frankish navy, built by Charles the Great, appears for a time to have driven the Northmen from the Channel, but they sailed into the Irish Sea and plundered Irish monasteries. In Dublin and on the islands off the west coast of Scotland the Northmen established convenient bases for their invasion of England and Frankland, when the Frankish fleet perished during the civil wars which followed the death of Charles. During this respite of forty-one years England enjoyed something like national union under Egbert, King of Wessex; but the English failed to recognise the importance of building an adequate national fleet, although Egbert's son, King Ethelwulf, was rich enough to earn distinction by his generosity when he visited Rome in 855. When Alfred, Ethelwulf's youngest son, ascended the throne in 871, England was almost entirely conquered by the Danish invaders. Under Alfred the English rallied and peace was made by the surrender of half England to the Danes. The London and North-Western Railway approximately divides Danish England, or the Danelaw, from that southern part of England which Alfred governed. Reinforcements for the Danes came to England from the North in long boats, called aescas, and, before Alfred's death, the war began afresh. "Then King Alfred commanded ships to be built against them, which were full nigh twice as long as the others. Some had sixty oars, some more. They were both swifter and steadier and also higher than the others; they

were shapen neither as the Frisian nor as the Danish, but as it seemed to himself that they might be most useful." As the Danes who had settled in England were beginning to amalgamate with the English and accept Christianity, Alfred's navy was able to do such service that King Edward, Alfred's son, was ruler of a united England, and, perhaps, though this is uncertain, of a united Great Britain. A further happy result was the establishment of friendly relations with the Scandinavian kingdoms during the reign of Athelstan, Edward's son.

During the latter half of the ninth century the Saracens also took advantage of the decadence of the Franks. They gained a footing in Southern Italy and threatened Rome. To avert this danger the Pope gave his blessing to a union of Western Europe under Charles the Fat; but it soon became evident that it was impossible to recreate the military power of Charles the Great. Rome ultimately obtained the assistance she required from a temporarily united Italy and the navy of Constantinople. The Northmen advanced up the Seine as far as Paris in the reign of Charles the Fat. The separate nationality of France began with the heroic defence of Paris by its local ruler Eudes. Charles the Fat contributed to this defence by bribing the Northmen to abandon the siege and gather plunder in other parts of his dominions. For a century the descendants of Eudes, calling themselves Dukes of the French, increased their hold over the territory which surrounded Paris until they finally absorbed the sovereign power of the descendants of Charles the Fat.

Before their extinction the Carlovingian rulers gave their sanction to the creation of two provincial governments which profoundly affected England. In 911 Charles the Simple gave Rolf, a chief of the Northmen, the province of Normandy with the title of duke. In their new territory pagan Northmen became in time French-speaking Christians. King Ethelwulf, Alfred's father, returned from his visit to Rome with Judith, the child of another Carlovingian ruler, Charles the Bald. This child-bride of an old man was for some months the wife of Ethelwulf's son King Ethelbald, who died in 860, soon after his accession to the throne of England. Judith then returned to her father's Court, from which she eloped with Baldwin, one of her father's officials. Ultimately the young couple were married, and Baldwin was created Count of Flanders, not the small strip of Belgian coast which now bears this name, but a province extending from the Scheldt to Normandy, and thus including all the coast of Europe which is nearest to England. The son of this romantic marriage, Baldwin II., married King Alfred's daughter. Thus close ties united the rulers of Flanders and England, whilst the Flemish and English peoples were united by ties no less close. Both were of Saxon origin and spoke the same language.

The English and Flemish were not only bound by race and language but there was a commercial bond of union which was growing in importance and was destined to mould the development of both peoples. The weaving industry of Flanders began long before the Norman Conquest of England. In the ninth century the Flemish were learning to depend on

English shepherds to supply their looms with wool. This economic interdependence closely resembles that which exists between Lancashire and the United States. This resemblance is increased by the kinship of American cotton-growers and English cotton-spinners and by their common tongue. The Anglo-Flemish economic bond and the forces called into play to prevent it from developing into political union affected England's policy for many centuries, until the bond was broken by the development of English weaving.

In the middle of the ninth century Pope Nicholas I. put forward a claim to absolute sovereignty over the Papal States and suzerainty over the rest of Europe. This claim was made before the Saracenic invasion of Italy, and was based on the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, a forgery like the pretended Donation of Constantine. The claim was at first of little practical importance on account of Rome's weakness, which continued after the Saracens were expelled from Italy in 916. Before that time storm clouds were threatening from the North. Pagan Hungarians invaded Germany and Italy, entering Italy in 899 and devastating the country as their Hunnish ancestors had done. In Germany the Hungarians were driven back by the Saxons under their duke, Henry the Fowler. In 936 Henry was succeeded by his son, Otto the Great, who completed the defeat, and then attempted to rescue Italy from the chaotic condition to which it had been reduced by the Saracens and Hungarians. In theory the Pope claimed to be suzerain of Europe; in practice his authority over Rome was re-established by a

Saxon who called himself over-lord of Germany and Italy. Before the end of the tenth century the papacy "seemed to have reached the utmost limit of its degradation."

The power of papal Rome had been founded on the production of the monasteries; in the tenth century the monastic system was dying and dragging the papacy into its tomb. Popes, bishops, abbots and monks were enjoying the wealth of Europe without performing those duties which should fall to the lot of the wealthy. Monasteries were losing their religious character when men and women embraced the religious life in order to find more worldly comfort in monasteries and convents than they could find in the world outside. Pilgrimages to Rome degenerated into commercial voyages. When the pilgrims were hindered from approaching Rome by the Hungarians, and when the Pope ceased to be able to command tribute from Europe, he also ceased to have value in the eyes of his Roman subjects. When the papacy was sick unto death relief was at hand. In 910 Berno of Cluny inaugurated a monastic reformation which spread throughout Europe and raised the papacy to an even greater height than it had reached before.

St. Dunstan was the apostle of the Cluniac reformation in England; and the work he did in restoring the English monastic system was part of a general European movement which again drew Saxon, Frank and Norman towards Rome. There is a curious resemblance between the histories of the Carlovingian and Saxon Empires. Both Charles the Great and Otto the Great failed to realise that the economic

power, which Rome possessed in monastic production, would ultimately prove stronger than force of arms. Like his predecessor Charles, the Saxon Emperor freed the papacy from its foes and enabled it to reassert its control over its landed possessions in Europe. Otto the Great also neglected to establish imperial authority in Rome and attacked the pagan North. King Harold Bluetooth of Denmark met the attack of Otto the Great and his son Otto II by the traditional counter-attack on Normandy. The Cluniac reformation reunited the producing monasteries to Rome, and thus closed markets which had been open to Danish trade. Two parties sprang up in Normandy, a monastic party, who desired to establish close relations with Rome, and an anti-monastic party, who wished to retain their old connexion with Denmark. Similar parties came into existence in England at a later date.

In 945 Harold Bluetooth, with the aid of Norman allies, won a victory on the banks of the Dive; and for a while Normandy was restored to the sphere of Danish influence. A dual alliance of the Saxon Emperors and the Carlovingian Kings of Laon was met by a triple alliance of Flanders, Normandy, and the Dukes of the French, who reigned at Paris. In the North the Germans defeated the Danes and compelled Harold Bluetooth to accept Christianity; but the conquest of Denmark was far from complete. Their Carlovingian allies fared badly. In 987 the dynasty of the descendants of Charles the Great was extinguished, and the Dukes of the French inherited an almost nominal sovereignty over powerful vassals,

amongst whom were the Dukes of Normandy and the Counts of Flanders.

In 940 Athelstan was succeeded by his brother Edmund, and six years later another brother, Edred, became King of England. It was during their reigns that St. Dunstan acquired power. At first Edmund appears to have feared the young monk ; but he finally yielded and made him Abbot of Glastonbury. Edred, a chronic invalid, allowed Dunstan to keep the royal deeds and treasures at Glastonbury. On his death-bed in 955 Edred called for the treasure ; but the king died before Dunstan's arrival. Then Edred's nephew, a boy of fifteen, became king. The chronicles are silent as to the fate of the treasure, but they tell of a violent quarrel between St. Dunstan and the King's mother-in-law. Edwy's marriage was dissolved ; and, after a very short reign, Edwy died. The scanty records of this short reign suggest a furious contest between the two parties. On the one hand Glastonbury Abbey was attacked, probably by searchers for the royal treasure, and Dunstan was banished ; on the other hand Edwy made lavish grants of land to other monasteries.

When Edgar, Edwy's brother, became king, St. Dunstan was recalled and the monks continued to increase their hold over England's soil. Grants of monastic lands were made by written books or conveyances which the kings signed by making their mark in the form of a cross. The consideration or price paid for the land was often the promised salvation of the king's soul ; and the lands were called boclands to distinguish them from the folclands held by the

people. Sometimes monastic lands were subject to the threefold obligation of repairing roads and bridges, maintaining fortifications, and military service ; but it was the lay tenants not the monks who could be asked to fight. Since even this threefold obligation was not always imposed, the area on which secular taxation could be levied was narrowed, and Alfred's navy was neglected by his successors.

Edward, surnamed the Martyr, became king when Edgar died in 975. His reign was short and troubled. The chronicler's statement that, in 976, " Alphere commanded the monasteries to be demolished, which King Edgar had before commanded the holy bishop Ethelwold to found," proves that there was active opposition to Edward's ecclesiastical councillors. Two years later the chronicle relates that "in this year King Edward was slain (martyred), and Ethelred Atheling, his brother, succeeded to the Kingdom." This is the king who was called Redeless, i.e. without counsel, a name naturally given to a king placed on the throne to free England from monkish advisers. This epithet has been distorted into Unready ; and all the misfortunes which befel England during Ethelred's reign have been attributed to Ethelred's lack of political foresight, although he was only ten years old when he began to reign. Thus the lesson which England's history in the tenth century teaches is obscured. Then, as in subsequent centuries, the diversion of money from England's army and navy has tempted the foreigner to attack her shores.

The Danes came in Ethelred's time ; in England the invaders found many Christians who preferred

alliance with the pagan to submission to monkish rule. The chronicle records repeated acts of treachery for which no other explanation seems possible. St. Dunstan died in 988, nine years after the accession of Ethelred. His last years were embittered by an attempt, made by his opponents, to seize Church land in the diocese of Rochester; but the cause of St. Dunstan was upheld by his successors. In 995 the monastic party regained power, and the secular clergy in Canterbury Cathedral were replaced by monks. The struggle in England was political rather than religious. The question at issue was not whether Christianity was to flourish in England, but whether celibate monks, whose chief interest was their order, and who looked to Rome as their centre, should be allowed to transform their hold over English land into complete control over the secular government of England. The secular clergy, or married parish priests, were on the other hand bound to England by family ties. When monks replaced secular priests in the cathedral chapters, they obtained a predominant voice in the appointment of bishops; and completely to control the Church was a long step towards the absorption of all authority over England.

Civil war in Denmark followed the baptism of Harold Bluetooth. The nationalist or pagan party found a leader in Harold's son, Sweyn, who succeeded to the Danish throne when his father was killed. In concert with Olaf of Norway, Sweyn invaded England, where he could count upon a certain amount of sympathy from the anti-monastic party. In the absence of an adequate navy Viking ships were able to select

undefended points on England's coast where they could land unopposed. Again and again the invaders were bribed to withdraw. During one of these attacks Olaf accepted Christianity and abandoned his alliance with Sweyn; but the Danes continued to attack England. Ship money was levied in England; but, owing to internal discord, the hurriedly collected fleet proved unequal to the defence of England's coast.

After leaving England Olaf became King of Norway only to lose his life and throne when attacked by Sweyn and King Olaf of Sweden. Then, in 1013, Sweyn began a serious invasion of England. By this time a change had occurred in Normandy; its connexion with the North had almost disappeared. Up to the commencement of the eleventh century the Danes found shelter in Normandy after harrying England. Two years later, in 1002, Ethelred married the daughter of Duke Richard of Normandy. Hence the English national party came to rely on the Danes whilst the cosmopolitans turned towards Normandy. Ethelred fled to Normandy when Sweyn invaded England in force. In 1014 Sweyn died, and Ethelred, recalled from Normandy, succeeded in expelling Canute, the son of Sweyn. Two years later Canute was preparing a fresh invasion when Ethelred died. After some fighting an arrangement was made between Canute and Edmund, Ethelred's successor, which, before the end of 1016, gave Canute undisputed possession of England on Edmund's death. When England thus became part of a Great Scandinavia, the Normans began to plan their scheme of conquest which was carried into effect by William I.

## IV

### THE COMING OF THE NORMAN

1000–1087

In the beginning of the eleventh century the Normans were establishing themselves in Southern Italy, where they were preparing for their daring attack upon the Byzantine Empire, whose capital, Constantinople, was the trading centre of the ancient world. To men with such ambitions it must have been bitterness itself to see the trade of England passing through Scandinavian hands; but at first the sea-power of Normandy was not equal to the task of snatching England from the Danes. Canute began his reign by trying to conciliate his actual and potential enemies. In the first year of his reign he married Emma, the widow of Ethelred and daughter of Duke Richard of Normandy. The presence of his stepsons Alfred and Edward at the Norman Court was not resented. Like a later King of France, Canute thought London worth a mass, and became a Christian. The remarkable manner in which Canute could adapt himself to circumstances is illustrated by his atrocious murder of a brother-in-law when the king was in his northern realm, and by his pious pilgrimage to Rome in the following year, 1026. In Rome Canute witnessed the coronation of

the first Franconian emperor, the Saxon line having ended with Henry the Saint.

Canute's brother-in-law Robert, who became Duke of Normandy in 1026, cultivated the friendliest relations with his neighbour, the Count of Flanders, and his overlord the King of France. In 1035 Canute died, shortly after the death of Duke Robert. Both were succeeded by sons born out of wedlock. William the Conqueror became Duke of Normandy and Harold Harefoot ascended the English throne. Harthacnut, the son of Canute and Emma, obtained the kingdom of Denmark. Thus the English again enjoyed an independent ruler.

Canute's successful reign was largely due to his minister, Earl Godwine, who by birth and marriage seems to have been connected with both Danes and Saxons. When Canute died, Godwine supported Harthacnut's claim to the crown of England; but he accepted Harold Harefoot, when the English chose him as king. The murder of Emma's son Alfred, when that prince imprudently crossed from Normandy to England, was supposed to have been contrived by Godwine. This murder was followed, in 1037, by Emma's expulsion from England. She sought the usual refuge for English exiles, Flanders, or, as it was then called, Baldwin's land. Two years later Harthacnut answered his mother's appeal, and was on the eve of invading England, when Harold Harefoot died. Harthacnut invited his half-brother Edward to share his throne. In 1042 "died Harthacnut as he stood at his drink, he suddenly fell to the earth with a terrible struggle. . . . And all the people then received

Edward for king, as was his natural right." The sudden deaths of two young kings, Harold and Harthacnut, fitted in with the Norman scheme. England was thus brought under the rule of a king who was half Norman by birth and wholly Norman by education.

Before the Normans could supplant Scandinavian influence in England it was necessary for them to secure the neutrality of Flanders in the inevitable war. With persistence, which overcame all obstacles, Duke William sought and finally obtained the hand of Matilda, daughter of the Flemish Count. A religious movement in Normandy, guided by Duke William, formed part of the scheme of conquest. The Norman bishops were chosen from the ducal family, and, like William's half-brother, Odo, were more at home on the field of battle than in their cathedrals. Monasteries were founded throughout Normandy. "A Norman noble of that age thought that his estate lacked its chief ornament if he failed to plant a colony of monks in some corner of his possessions." Freeman regarded these founders as often actuated by motives other than religious, since "many a man must have founded a religious house, not from any special devotion or any special liberality, but simply because it was the regular thing for a man in his position to do." Thus Norman dukes controlled their Church, while they gained the goodwill of the monastic party in England.

The condition of the papacy favoured the creation of a Norman Church under ducal control. In 1033 the Pope was a dissolute boy twelve years of age, and, at a

later date, there were three rival Popes. As the papacy emerged from this degradation it became involved in a desperate struggle with the Normans of Southern Italy. In 1053 the papal army was utterly defeated by the Normans at Civita Vecchia. Like his imperial predecessor, the Pope spent two days bewailing his lost legions, and then set to work to replace them by enlisting his conquerors in the service of Rome. The Italian Normans were confirmed in their possessions as vassals under the suzerainty of the Pope; and they turned their attention to the boundless wealth which awaited those who could conquer Constantinople and the Eastern Empire. The Cluniac Reformation had already produced the monk Hildebrand who was destined to restore the glory of Rome. Before Hildebrand became Pope Gregory VII. in 1073, his policy was being carried out by Pope Alexander II. The banner of William the Conqueror was blessed by Alexander, and the Conquest of England was the real First Crusade.

To ensure a successful invasion the Normans neglected no opportunity of creating disunion in England during the reign of Edward the Confessor. The central figure in this period of English history is not the weak king but Earl Godwine and, after the Earl's death in 1053, his eldest surviving son, Harold. During the early years of Edward's reign Godwine was in power; and such attention was paid to the navy "that no man had seen any greater force in the land." But Norman ecclesiastics followed Edward to England; among these the most prominent was Robert, Abbot of Jumièges, whom Edward appointed Bishop of

London. Since the production of wool, the chief export of England, was mainly in the hands of the monks, it is probable that Scandinavian traders suffered from this Norman ecclesiastical influence. About this time the Chronicle records the coming of hostile sailors from the north, who took "whatever they could find; and then went east to Baldwin's land and there sold what they had plundered."

In 1051 the Norman Bishop of London was made Archbishop of Canterbury; and foreigners began to treat the English as an already conquered race. Count Eustace of Boulogne quarrelled with the men of Kent when he was returning from a visit to King Edward. When Godwine refused to punish the Kentish men, whom he regarded as peculiarly his own folk, he and his sons were forced to take refuge in flight from England. Godwine's daughter, whom Edward had married, was sent to a nunnery; and for a while Norman influence reigned supreme.

Three interesting events occurred during this period of England's peaceful penetration by the Normans. In 1049 "King Edward discharged nine ships from pay, and they went away ships and all; and five ships remained behind, and the King promised them twelve months' pay." Next year all the ships were discharged. This policy was so successful financially that in 1052 "King Edward abolished the military contribution which King Ethelred had before imposed; that was in the nine-and-thirtieth year after he had begun it. That tax distressed all the English nation during so long a space as is here above written." After Godwine's flight, "soon came Count William from

beyond sea, with a great body of Frenchmen, and the King received him and as many of his companions as it pleased him, and let him go again."

This meeting of King Edward and his great neighbour William, while the navy was being weakened that the burden of taxation might be lessened, did not please the English. A popular movement restored Godwine to his old position, and sent the Norman Archbishop and his brethren in hurried flight across the sea. Godwine died soon after his return; and his eldest surviving son, Harold, continued Godwine's work. Stigand, an Englishman, replaced the Norman Archbishop of Canterbury; and Harold governed England with such ability that it seemed as if the Norman scheme would come to nought when party strife wrecked England's hopes. The latent antagonism between the Danish North and the Saxon South became acute in 1065, and Harold's brother, Tostig, who had been Earl of Northumbria since 1055, was compelled to betake himself to Baldwin's land. There he entered into negotiations with William of Normandy and Harold, King of Norway. From his brother-in-law, Count Baldwin, Tostig obtained men and ships for an expedition to England.

In January 1066 King Edward died, and Harold was elected and crowned King of England. "He then gathered so great a naval force and also a land force as no king here in the land had before gathered; because it had for truth been said to him that Count William from Normandy, King Edward's kinsman, would come hither and subdue this land." But Tostig came first, and was driven out by the Northumbrians.

Tostig then joined Harold of Norway, entered the Humber, and captured York. Harold of England hurried north. The allies were defeated; Tostig and Harold of Norway were killed, while Olaf, the Norwegian king's son, was allowed to return to Norway. Immediate danger seemed to have passed away; but Edward's policy of reducing the navy accomplished its perfect work. The enthusiasm which had extemporised a fleet evaporated when provisions ran short through lack of funds. The English fleet disappeared; and in September William came again to England. This time he came not as an honoured guest but as a conqueror. In October 1066 a great battle was fought near Hastings. Harold of England with his brothers and many another Englishman died for England with the same burning patriotism as filled Nelson's soul at Trafalgar. But Nelson had an adequate fleet, while the English in Harold's time enjoyed remission of taxation; hence, although there were about two million Englishmen, William and some fifty thousand conquerors took possession of the land. The peasants, deprived of their natural leaders, were forced to accept their foreign masters. The English were compelled to build castles which the Norman lords filled with their own followers. When these strongholds were built the power of the Norman was irresistible. Where the people fought hard for freedom, as in Yorkshire, the English were exterminated and their land was made a desert waste. The bravest of the English were killed or forced to leave their island. About this time the Waring bodyguard of the Emperor at Constantinople received a large number of recruits from England;

these English soldiers were held in the highest esteem for their loyalty and courage.

Before the Conquest a large part of the land of England was owned by monks and the clergy. William sailed with a banner which the Pope had blessed, and the invasion received papal approval because the English Church was becoming too independent of Rome. After the Conquest England's Church was pillaged, the Normans were astonished at the plunder sent across the Channel. Norman abbeys and churches were made splendid with spoil taken from the religious foundations of England. English bishops and abbots were replaced by ecclesiastics from Normandy, so that foreigners ruled over the English Church as well as over the English peasant. Stigand was deposed from the Archbishopric of Canterbury, and the see was filled by William's friend, Lanfranc. Other English bishops and abbots shared Stigand's fate until there was only one English bishop left, the saintly Wulfstan of Worcester; he it was who prevailed upon the merchants of Bristol to abandon their trade in Irish slaves. In the half-mythical story of Wulfstan's life it is easy to see that his personal holiness conquered England's conqueror: "William was mild to the good men who loved God."

Yet England survived in her towns. Many of these suffered during the invasion; but some, and among these London, the greatest of all, escaped without injury. With London, William made a treaty guaranteeing to her citizens the liberties which they had enjoyed under their late King Edward. The Londoners asked to be allowed to trade in their own

way without interference, and when this was granted to them, they appear to have been careless about the fate of other Englishmen. The success of the Normans was largely due to this lack of unity in England. Men cared for their shire or their town, the larger conception of duty to England was very imperfectly recognised. Yet while England was governed by foreign masters speaking a different tongue from that of their English serfs, and while peasants learned to acquiesce in the rule of the stranger and kill one another at the bidding of their alien rulers, patriotism developed in England, and an English nation was born.

Just as the English of Chaucer differs from the Anglo-Saxon of the Chronicle, so the new English folk differed from the shepherds whom William had enslaved. Both the English race and the English language have a strong Anglo-Saxon element, and both have been changed by influences from outside. Chaucer wrote in the speech of London, and the town was the birthplace of the new English. The reason for this is not difficult to discover. The towns of England protected their home trade; and by their protective system they gained such strength that in time they conquered their conquerors. Though the land and agricultural production of England was owned by the Church and the Normans, English ultimately replaced monkish Latin and Norman French. England owes the commencement of her national life to the protective policy of her towns.

The Benedictine monks who came to England with St. Augustine in 597 believed that work was as sacred as prayer. It was, doubtless, partly owing to the

excellent use they made of the land that Anglo-Saxon kings granted them so much of the soil of England. For centuries after the Norman Conquest monks continued to flock to England, and wherever they settled sheep-farming flourished. Some of the wool was woven in England into coarse cloth for peasants, but much of it was exported to Flanders, where it was increased in value eightfold by being woven into good cloth. It is known that during the twelfth century lists were kept in Flanders giving the names of 102 English abbeys with the minimum value of the wool they produced. The English were not devoid of skill. Anglo-Saxon gold embroidery had a great reputation. But the English were not progressive; they were content to grow wool and leave the weaving to the Flemish.

Flanders was once a land which extended from the Scheldt to the frontier of Normandy, and included a considerable portion of Northern France with all the nearest coast to England. The Flemish were a branch of the Saxons. In the twelfth century English and Flemish peasants could talk to each other without the aid of an interpreter. Flanders was the Lancashire of the Middle Ages when wool held the place which cotton now holds. The Anglo-Flemish wool trade was of importance as far back as the tenth century; for five centuries it moulded the destinies of England and Flanders.

When they settled in England the Anglo-Saxons lost the love of the sea which had been their characteristic. There was, however, a considerable amount of trade between England and Frankland, and the coming

of the Danes partly broke down the isolation of the Anglo-Saxon villages. The Anglo-Saxons were connected with the East by the great Baltic trade route, whose centre was at Wisby on the island of Gothland, and which ran down the long Russian rivers to the Caspian and the Baltic. This connexion ceased when the Normans subdued England. One body of middlemen were more fortunate. Merchants from Cologne obtained a footing in England in the reign of Ethelred the Redeless. The reason for the welcome given them is not hard to discover. The English left their foreign trade to others ; but they bitterly resented any invasion of their home trade. Hides and wool were sold in market towns and carried down the rivers to ports, such as London, where foreign shippers waited for their cargoes. The manufactures of England were of a primitive character, suited only to the wants of tillers of the soil, and England's foreign trade was monopolised by aliens, Easterlings and others ; but the English protected the one thing left to them, the inland trade. To this protection England owes the preservation of her nationality in her towns and the freedom which ultimately spread from the towns to the country. Briefly stated, the ideal the English trader had always in view was to keep the foreign merchant at the wharf head. If the foreigner entered the town he had to choose an English host, who was responsible for his guest's behaviour. The foreigner was to deal with none but citizens of the town, and retail trade was forbidden him. The length of his stay was limited to forty days, and he was required to buy English produce equal in amount to the goods he sold.

This policy in its entirety was a counsel of perfection, and was seldom completely attained. The wool-growing magnates continually tried to get into direct touch with the foreign buyer, and were steadily resisted by the English trader. Much of England's early history is made up of this struggle between magnate and merchant. It culminated in the War of the Roses, which led to the protection of industry as well as of inland trade, and to the splendour of the Tudor period.

Under England's foreign kings, protective associations for inland trade, or merchant gilds, sprang into existence in every considerable English town, except London and the Cinque Ports. "Nevertheless London, and probably some of the Cinque Ports, virtually exercised all the rights attached to this franchise, though the name and formal organisation were unknown in these towns." The granting of "good laws even as we ourselves" to German merchants by King Ethelred implies that natives enjoyed advantages denied to foreigners. In the Conqueror's charter to London he declared that it was his "will that you be all law-worthy, as you were in the days of King Edward." When other towns obtained the right of Gild Merchant they were given the privilege which London already possessed.

Jews came to England with the Conqueror. They were not fettered by ecclesiastical regulations which forbade the lending of money on interest or the taking more than a just price for goods. These restrictions, like modern factory regulations, were imposed in the interest of the community But, even under foreign

kings, the English trader had a protection from his unrestricted rival which is denied to English workers to-day. The Jew was wise in trade matters with the wisdom of ages; but neither his wisdom nor his freedom enabled him to penetrate the Merchant Gild. The inland trade was kept in English hands, and the towns grew strong.

Like all human institutions England's first protective system was far from perfect. It protected the trader, not the worker. This was of little importance in early times, since English industry was almost non-existent, and her production of raw material did not need protection. The worst fault of the Merchant Gild was its parochial character. The citizen of one town treated an Englishman from a neighbouring town as a foreigner. In this respect there is a marked resemblance to the treatment which Great Britain now extends to her Colonies. But before long a system of preferential treatment arose by means of arrangements between the gilds. Then England was covered with a linked network of protective associations which baffled Jew and foreigner, but gave freedom to the English. Anglo-Saxon, Dane and Norman became gild brethren, and thus learned to be brother Englishmen. Sheltered within their protective associations the new English grew to be so strong that in time they moulded the character of the dwellers in England. The conquered island became an independent nation. When protection of industry was added to protection of trade the foundation of the British Empire was well and truly laid.

The character of William the Conqueror is given

in the Chronicle. "If any one desires to know what kind of man he was, or what worship he had, or of how many lands he was lord, then we will write of him so as we understood him who have looked on him, and, at another time, sojourned in his court. The King William, about whom we speak, was a very wise man, and very powerful, more dignified and strong than any of his predecessors were. He was mild to the good men who loved God; and over all measure severe to the men who gainsayed his will. . . . In his days was the noble monastery at Canterbury built, and also very many others over all England. This land was also plentifully supplied with monks, and they lived their lives after the rule of St. Benedict. . . . Amongst other things is not to be forgotten the good peace that he made in this land; so that a man who in himself was aught might go over his realm, with his bosom filled with gold, unhurt.

"Wales was in his power, and he therein wrought castles and completely ruled over that race of men. In like manner he also subjected Scotland to him by his great strength. The land of Normandy was naturally his; and over the country which is called Le Maine he reigned, and if he might yet have lived two years he would, by his valour, have won Ireland, and without any weapons. . . . He planted a great preserve for deer, and he laid down laws therewith, that whosoever should slay hart or hind should be blinded. He forbade the harts and also the boars to be killed. As greatly did he love the tall deer as if he were their father. He also ordained concerning the hares that they should go free. His great men

bewailed it, and the poor men murmured thereat; but he was so obdurate, that he recked not of the hatred of them all; but they must wholly follow the King's will, if they would live, or have land, or property, or even his peace."

This was the view of the Southern Englishman, whose laws and customs the Conqueror respected, when they did not clash with the rights he had acquired by conquest. Nevertheless the English suffered the woe of the vanquished. Some fled to the East, and in the Varangian guard of the Byzantine Emperor had the satisfaction of preventing the Normans of Sicily from seizing the Eastern Empire. Others fled to the fenlands, and continued an heroic resistance until their leader, Hereward, was killed in 1072. But in the end England was subdued. The motley host of Normans, Flemings and Franks who followed William were rewarded with grants of land on which the English toiled as serfs. As the Conqueror was recognised as the supreme landowner of all England these grants were perpetual leases for which rent in the form of military service was paid. In this way an important step was taken towards the unification of England.

In the middle of the eleventh century war between Norway and Denmark weakened both kingdoms. The Danes in Denmark and England tried to remain neutral during the Conquest. They were rescued by Harold of England from Tostig and his Norwegian ally, but they gave little or no aid to Harold of England when William landed.

If they hoped that William would be satisfied with

the conquest of Saxon England they were soon undeceived. The Flemish also realised their mistake when England became subject to the Normans. As a reward for the services which he had rendered to William, Baldwin V. obtained a grant of 300 marks a year, and, after his death in 1067, the annuity was paid to his younger son, Baldwin VI., during the three years of his rule over Flanders. It is almost impossible to deny the existence of an economic cause for the change in Danish and Flemish policy which followed the Conquest of England.

In the reign of Ethelred the Redeless, merchants from Flanders, Normandy, France and Germany were allowed to trade at the port of London subject to the payment of customs' duties of about 5 per cent. Wool, hides and metals were exported from England. William's grandfather, the tanner of Falaise, must often have dressed English hides. Most of the exported wool went to feed the looms of Flanders, and the Anglo-Flemish trade was principally carried on by merchants from Cologne. In Ethelred's laws the men of the Emperor are singled out "as worthy of good laws, even as we ourselves." This privileged position the Germans retained until the reign of Elizabeth. Their concession, the Steelyard, once stood where Cannon Street Station now stands, and for centuries the Easterlings of the Steelyard almost monopolised England's, trade with Flanders and Northern Europe. In return for England's exports she received wine from Normandy carried down the Seine, cloth from Flanders, and such Eastern luxuries as found their way along the great commercial route which, starting

from Venice, crossed the Alps and passed down the Rhine to Cologne.

Less is known of the Scandinavian trade with England. Its centre was probably York, and the "incredible number" of Anglo-Saxon coins found at Wisby proves that it was of much importance. In Canute's reign Scandinavian traders must have gained at the expense of their Norman rivals; but after the accession of Edward the Confessor, the Normans appear to have regained their position in Southern England. The Scandinavian harryings in Edward's reign took place in Essex and Kent: it seems probable that these markets had been closed to Northern traders. The Northern English, dreaming perhaps that the Conqueror would not interfere with their local autonomy, idly watched the conquest of the South and West of England. But in 1068 York was captured and garrisoned by Normans.

In 1069, when the Danes realised that their connexion with England was being destroyed, a Danish fleet sailed to England. The men of Yorkshire joined the Danes, and William hurried north to crush the movement. He was "over all measure severe to the men who gainsaid his will." By fire and sword Yorkshire was made a desert, to wait in its desolation for the Cistercian monks who made wildernesses blossom like the rose. The death of Baldwin VI. in 1070, whilst William was exterminating the shepherds of Northern England, was followed by civil war in Flanders. In spite of the intervention of William and Philip I. of France, the ruler and the policy of Flanders were changed. Robert the Frisian became

Count and friendly relations with England ceased. On the other hand, Philip of France recognised the new Count and formed an alliance with him by marrying Bertha of Frisia.

The Cluniac reformation was at this time extending its influence over Northern Europe. The Olaf who was allowed by Harold to return to Norway aided the movement, and Saint Canute, who ruled over Denmark until his martyrdom in 1086, was canonised for his devotion to the cause of the Church. When Canute became King of Denmark in 1080 he was the husband of the daughter of Count Robert of Flanders, and Arnold, a missionary monk, was bringing the Flemish into close communion with Rome. Strained relations between William and Gregory VII. enabled the Northern kingdoms to serve Rome whilst they evolved a scheme for the destruction of the Norman rule over England.

The monk Hildebrand began his reign, as Pope Gregory VII., in 1073, by enunciating the papal claims in their most extreme form. He asserted that the Pope was the supreme sovereign with the right of deposing all secular rulers. From the weaker kingdoms, including England, he asked for an immediate acknowledgment of his suzerainty. He sought to use the strength which the Church possessed in her vast estates by making the clergy free from all secular control and entirely dependent on Rome. To separate the clergy from the people amongst whom they dwelt he commanded all priests to adopt the monkish custom of celibacy. His first and greatest antagonist was the Emperor Henry IV., who claimed to be over-

lord of Italy and Germany. The Emperor was excommunicated, and the loose feudal organisation over which he ruled declined to support a stricken leader. In 1077 Gregory's victory seemed complete, when Henry in the robes of a penitent begged for pardon at Canossa. But there followed a swift reaction, and with it a fierce struggle between Emperor and Pope.

The Church and Christendom were both rent asunder in this quarrel. An anti-Pope and a second Emperor added to the confusion. The married clergy ranged themselves against the monks; and in 1084 Henry was master of all Rome except the stronghold of St. Angelo, in which Gregory waited for Guiscard and the Italian Normans, who had become his most trusted allies. Henry retired as the Normans approached the sacred city, and Gregory obtained his freedom when Guiscard sacked Rome with more than Vandal fury. Next year the great Pope died, leaving behind him unsolved problems which even now have scarcely ceased to trouble Europe.

The papacy had sanctioned William's invasion in order that the English Church might be brought into complete subjection to Rome; and Gregory asked for more than this. William refused to admit the Pope's claim of suzerainty; but he granted to the clergy the right of being tried in their own courts, and thus created an almost independent body within his dominions. The ancient tribute of Peter's Pence was again sent to Rome, and the question of the celibacy of the clergy was compromised. The cathedral clergy, who had a voice in the election of bishops, were for-

bidden to marry, and bishops were warned not to ordain married men; but the parochial clergy were allowed to keep their wives. The question of the King's right of appointment to bishoprics and abbacies was not raised. The tact of Archbishop Lanfranc made this compromise possible; but it merely postponed the inevitable conflict between Church and King, and William was almost drawn into this conflict shortly before his death.

Odo, Bishop of Bayeux and Earl of Kent, as well as the Conqueror's half-brother, raised an army in 1082 which he intended to lead from the Isle of Wight to Italy. He hoped to win the papal throne when he and Guiscard had driven the Emperor from Italy; but William had no wish for a Pope who knew England as Odo did. Odo was impeached, and, when the barons hesitated to judge a bishop, William sent his brother to a castle in Normandy, explaining his conduct by saying that he arrested the Earl of Kent, not the Bishop of Bayeux. Gregory sent a gentle remonstrance, of which no notice was taken. There were others ready to defend the Church. An armada of more than a thousand ships was prepared by the devout rulers of Denmark, Norway and Flanders. Had William been less resourceful there might have been another conquest of England. Mercenary soldiers were imported from Normandy; the English coast was devastated that the invader might not be able to obtain supplies. That he should be unable to distinguish friend from foe, the English were forced to shave and dress like Normans; and William's agents carried gold to Denmark to foster mutiny. St. Canute

was killed in the mutiny, and the armada never reached the shores of England. A year later, in 1087, William died, whilst fighting Philip of France. On his deathbed the Conqueror gave Normandy to his eldest son Robert, England to William Rufus, and a gift of money to his youngest son Henry. He thus separated the lands which he had tried to unite. William Rufus was accepted as king by the citizens of London, but he trampled on the unprotected peasants when he had established his power.

## V

### NORMAN AND ENGLISH

### 1087–1155

SEVENTEEN days after the Conqueror's death in Normandy William Rufus was crowned in Westminster, to the great joy of the English. The Norman magnates appear to have been taken by surprise. As soon as they could combine they rose in rebellion, and were reinforced by their brethren from Normandy. The object of the rising was to prevent the separation of England and Normandy by making Robert ruler of both lands. Under one ruler wealth wrung from English serfs could be used, as in the Conqueror's reign, to pay a Norman army which could keep the English in perpetual subjection. Few Norman barons supported the King, but, by a promise of good laws, William won over the English. A fleet was collected which severed communication with Normandy, and Wulfstan, the last of the English bishops, led an army which defeated the Norman barons and their followers. When the insurrection was crushed William treated the rebel barons with marked leniency, whilst he treated the English with greater severity than his father.

This sudden uprising of an apparently conquered race and its equally sudden relapse into a condition of

servitude can be explained by the difference which existed between the town and country districts of England. In the English language there is a permanent record of the subjugation of the countryside of England. The English country folk became servants who tended cattle, sheep and pigs, which were served to Norman masters as beef, veal, mutton, and pork. The military leaders, who obtained estates, had to supply the King with soldiers when need arose ; hence English sub-tenants must have been largely replaced by Normans. The Conqueror extended this feudal obligation to Church lands, and, when Normans governed the Church, ecclesiastical farms must have been given, to some extent, to Norman farmers. Deprived of leaders the English peasantry became oppressed tillers of the soil.

But, from the first, the Conqueror tried to conciliate the towns. London surrendered without a struggle, and obtained a charter promising its citizens the good laws of King Edward. Though the Tower was built to overawe the Londoners it was not used. There was peace within London's walls while the English were being subdued. After the Conquest, merchants came to London from the towns of Normandy, and Jews settled in English Jewries under the guardianship of the foreign King. The Church afforded a certain amount of shelter to the conquered English. It was the one institution of which the feudal magnates stood in awe. Although the English bishops and abbots were replaced by Normans, the parochial clergy and the monks were English. The past and the present of Ireland illustrate the way in which a priesthood,

anti-national in the sense that it regards an Italian Pope as its head, can yet identify itself with the national aspirations of a subject people. The Pope and his claims were mere abstractions, while the tyranny of the King and his Norman magnates was a very present trouble. The gilds were partly shielded from attack by their semi-religious character, as the son of an English peasant gained comparative freedom by taking holy orders.

William II. realised that the power of the Church threatened the arbitrary rule of the Normans. He has been handed down in history as one who delighted in oppressing both his Church and his English subjects. When Lanfranc died in 1089 the vacant archbishopric was not filled. William declared that no one but he should be Archbishop of Canterbury, and the revenue of the see filled the royal purse. Conscience-smitten during an illness in 1092, the King appointed Anselm, abbot of a Norman monastery, to the vacant see ; but even before his enthronement Anselm quarrelled with his King about their respective rights over Church lands. The Archbishop maintained Gregory's theory of the absolute independence of the Church, and sought to extend episcopal power over abbeys which the Norman King looked upon as part of the royal possessions. On the other hand, the King shocked his contemporaries by his contempt for religion and his determination to establish the royal supremacy. After a long conflict the Archbishop left England in 1097 to carry an appeal to the Pope. A new king was on the throne when Anselm returned.

William II. might have succeeded in unifying

Great Britain if he had not devoted his energy to re-uniting England and Normandy. Wales was made somewhat more subject to Norman rule ; but Scotland kept her autonomy under the vague suzerainty of the Norman King. Many Norman barons obtained fiefs in Scotland. In the lowlands of the northern kingdom the people peacefully accepted these Normans as leaders. In Scotland there was not that gulf between conquerors and conquered, between landlords and serfs, which was so keenly felt in England.

Though the English took only a small part in the crusades, the indirect influence of these wars on English history was great, and their commencement was the most important event in the reign of William II. The overthrow of the Caliphate of Egypt by the Seljouks in 1077 made a profound impression on Christendom. Religion, politics, and commerce were inseparably connected in the Middle Ages, and all three were affected. The Pope could bestow pardon for sin to the religious, Eastern principalities to feudal lords, the restoration of the lucrative Eastern trade to merchants if they would attempt to rescue the Holy Land. The Flemish and Venetians, who owned the gates of the trade route which passed by way of the Rhine from the Adriatic to the North Sea, were the most prominent members of the First Crusade. Robert the Frisian had made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem and had learned the views of the Byzantine Emperor when he visited Constantinople. His son Robert II. was therefore carrying out his dead father's policy when he led the First Crusade. Robert II. refused the throne of Jerusalem, but it was accepted by Godfrey de

Bouillon, whose father the Count of Boulogne was a vassal of Flanders.

Duke Robert of Normandy also joined the First Crusade. He appears to have gained nothing in the East, and his crusading zeal cost him the kingdom of England. Money for his expedition was borrowed from William Rufus, who became Regent of Normandy in Robert's absence. In 1099, six weeks after the capture of Jerusalem, William II. was killed in the New Forest. In hot haste, Henry, the youngest of the Conqueror's sons, rode to Winchester and seized the royal treasure. Three days after William's death Henry I. was crowned at Westminster. Thus London and the Church of England again chose a ruler who, though he was a Norman, relied upon English support. Henry began his reign by granting freedom to the Church and the laws of Edward to the people in a formal charter. Although the rights of the Norman barons were also safeguarded in the charter, they took arms against Henry and Robert landed in England. War was averted by Henry's diplomacy; and Robert waived his claim to the English crown. Before this invasion Henry had endeared himself to the English by marrying the daughter of the King of Scotland, who through her mother was descended from the Saxon kings.

Norman barons, who owned fiefs on both sides of the Channel, were strongly in favour of one monarch for both Norman lands. Discontent in Normandy led to anarchy, and Henry intervened. In 1106 the battle of Tinchebrai united England and Normandy under Henry's rule. Duke Robert was placed in

honourable confinement in England; but his son and heir, William Clito, was entrusted to one of Henry's Norman supporters, who, in 1111, allowed the young prince to escape to Paris. Though neither the French King nor the Flemish Count viewed with pleasure the union of England and Normandy, the Flemish forced their Count to adopt a peaceful attitude towards Henry when he became ruler of Normandy. The stint of Eastern fabrics, caused by the Seljouk invasion, gave an impetus to the weaving industry of Flanders and rendered the Flemish more dependent on English wool. The sentimental bond of a common ruler, which linked Normandy to England, proved too weak to stand the wear and tear of time, while the commercial union of England and Flanders increased in strength until the English learned to weave. Then Flemish weaving and the commercial tie were both destroyed.

The annuity, which bound the Count of Flanders to William the Conqueror, was suspended after the revolution which made Robert the Frisian master of Flanders. William II. renewed the payment to Count Robert II., but it was discontinued while the Count was in the Holy Land. On his return Robert haughtily demanded the money and the arrears from Henry I. In reply the Count was told that the payment was not tribute but a retaining fee for service to be rendered in case of need. In 1101 and again in 1103 treaties were signed promising Flemish aid in certain contingencies, and the annuity was increased. These treaties did not, however, prevent Robert from forming an alliance with the King of France after

Tinchebrai. About the year 1100 the sea broke through the dykes of Flanders; and, owing to the inundations and the disease which followed, a number of weavers emigrated to England and settled in Pembrokeshire and elsewhere. This was the commencement of cloth-making in England as a definite industry. Its development was, however, very slow. The magnates, who grew the wool, were concerned mainly with obtaining a market for their produce and cared little whether this market was at home or abroad. When England's foreign rulers became national kings they tried to foster home manufacture, but their policy was often opposed by monk and lord. After the introduction of weaving more than three centuries had to elapse and two civil wars had to be fought before the English were able to protect industry as well as inland trade. Then England began the series of industrial conquests which ultimately made her supreme in production and commerce.

In 1119 Charles, a Danish prince, became Count of Flanders after the short reign of Baldwin VII. Charles, for a time, abandoned the pro-French policy of his predecessors, in order to conciliate his insurgent subjects. Henry made use of this opportunity by arranging to end the Anglo-French war which commenced after Tinchebrai with a favourable peace. At the zenith of his success, Henry's plans were shattered by the death of his only legitimate son in the wreck of the *White Ship*. Henry's enemies were encouraged by this accident. William Clito was married to the daughter of the powerful Count of Anjou that he might be a menace to Henry's dominion

over Normandy; and Charles of Flanders again became the close ally of the French King.

The long wars between France and England practically began after Tinchebrai. No peace, however carefully devised, could permanently end a struggle which was caused by the economic development of the people. Had the Normans become great weavers a commercial bond might have united Normandy, instead of Flanders, to England. But the chief factor which made for union between England and Normandy was the possession of estates in both lands by feudal lords. In course of time English and Norman estates passed into different hands, and the motive for union tended to disappear. The actual domain of the King of France was comparatively small and was shut off from the sea by the provinces of his almost independent vassals, of whom the King of England became the greatest. The feudal Anglo-French wars were thus inevitable; and when the loss of Normandy made peace appear possible, the fight for the market of Flanders supplied a motive for the Hundred Years' War. Even in the earlier feudal wars the market which Flanders afforded to English wool played an important part.

Henry was a widower when the *White Ship* sank. Within two months of the disaster he married the daughter of the Duke of Brabant, thus allying himself with the ruler of a State which had aided the Flemish who had rebelled against Charles of Flanders. William Clito's marriage and the Franco-Flemish alliance followed naturally. Henry's second marriage proved unfruitful; nevertheless he pressed on his imperial

scheme. In 1125 his daughter was left a widow by the death of the German Emperor. She was then recognised as Henry's heiress; and the spiritual and temporal lords of England swore allegiance to her in 1127. In the same year Anjou was detached from the French alliance, the Pope was induced to annul William Clito's marriage, Matilda was betrothed to Geoffrey, son and heir of the Count of Anjou, and Charles of Flanders was killed by rebels in Flanders, whose object was to make William of Ypres their Count and thus renew friendly relations with England.

The French King suppressed this democratic insurrection and gave Flanders to William Clito; but in spite of the severity with which the leaders of the revolt were punished, the Flemish refused to accept the French King's nominee, protesting that, since English merchants had ceased to visit Flanders, ruin was close at hand. It can be claimed for Henry that he was the originator of the policy of influencing the Flemish by stinting their supply of wool, as well as the founder of the English weaving industry. Henry put forward candidates for the countship. His nephew Stephen of Boulogne, a fief of Flanders, and another candidate failed, but a third candidate, Thierry of Alsace, ultimately succeeded. The burghers of Flanders espoused Thierry's cause; and William Clito was killed in the fighting which ensued. Another candidate then appeared; and Henry was asked to decide between the claimants. In order to retain even his nominal suzerainty the French King was forced to acquiesce in a decision which assigned the countship to Henry himself as the lawful heir; but in the same

decision Henry ceded his rights to Thierry. In the words of a Belgian historian, Flanders was treated as "a fief completely dependent on the crown of England."

Stephen of Boulogne was compelled to do homage to the new count; but he showed his ill-will by harbouring William of Ypres, one of the rival claimants. Under Thierry the burghers gained many political rights. Their weaving cities were growing rapidly and becoming more powerful. As their power increased they became more independent of their lords. The Flemish, whose industrial development preceded that of the Normans, French, and English, were naturally the first to acquire free institutions. Their example inspired their neighbours with a longing for freedom; and feudalism began to decay. The last years of Henry's life were years of peace. In 1133, two years before the king's death, his daughter Matilda gave him a grandson and future heir.

Much of Henry's success was due to his diplomacy in dealing with Rome. After the death of William Rufus, Anselm was recalled to England; and, in his charter, Henry promised that the Church should be free. Anselm interpreted this promise literally, but Henry found that this liberty was incompatible with his royal power. In 1103 Anselm again left England. He returned in 1106, when the dispute was settled by a compromise which formed a precedent for the Concordat of Worms, agreed to by Pope and Emperor in 1122. This compromise allowed the Pope to instal bishops in their spiritual offices, while the King granted them their worldly possessions. Anselm died in 1109,

fighting to the very last for the rights of the Pope and the Church of England. While supporting a body which afforded some protection to the conquered English, Anselm enforced celibacy on all clergy and weakened the bond between the Church and the people of England. During the rest of Henry's reign the see of Canterbury was filled in succession by two foreigners who succeeded in serving Pope and King.

While Henry appeared to be making the power of Norman royalty irresistible, two other forces were growing in England with even greater rapidity. The Cluniac reformation had not spent its force. New monasteries were being founded; and, with each foundation, the power of the Church and her hold over the production of wool was strengthened. The towns, too, were growing. London was becoming a residential city for magnates as well as a great centre of commerce. The charters, which gave towns and merchant gilds the right of protecting their commerce, were producing their natural effect. When Henry died in 1135 his nephew, Stephen of Boulogne, put himself forward as a candidate for the throne. Stephen went at once to London and secured the support of the citizens. His two uncles had made the securing of Winchester and the royal treasury their first concern. Stephen's brother, Henry, who had been a monk in the Abbey of Cluny, was appointed to the see of Winchester in 1130. Stephen may, therefore, have thought that his interests were safe in his brother's hands. After some hesitation the clerical magnates were induced to violate their oath to Matilda; and Stephen was crowned at Westminster three weeks after Henry's death.

At first both in England and in Normandy there was less opposition to Stephen than there had been to his uncles William Rufus and Henry I. After some hesitation the barons of Normandy accepted Stephen and repulsed Geoffrey and Matilda when they came to claim the duchy. Baronial revolts in Devon and Norfolk were easily suppressed, though the Welsh threw off the Norman yoke and King David of Scotland declared for Matilda. One writer describes an attempted insurrection of the English, but nothing came of this. The subjugation of the peasants was so complete that, in that part of Yorkshire which had been ravaged by the Conqueror, Saxon archers helped Normans and Flemings to defeat the Saxons of Scotland in 1138 at the battle of the Standard. The civil wars in England were not complicated by servile insurrections, and there were no more invasions from the north. The civil wars were fought by mercenary soldiers, such as the men from the Low Countries, who, with their leader, William of Ypres, were imported by Stephen. Parts of England, which were not the actual scenes of battle, appear to have been little affected. King Stephen tried to conciliate interests which were incompatible with his sovereignty. In a second charter he granted complete independence to the Church. The see of Canterbury fell vacant in 1136. Stephen opposed the election of his brother, Henry of Winchester, and, in 1139, Theobald, a foreign monk, was consecrated Archbishop, while Henry was appointed papal legate. Then followed a quarrel between Church and King, general anarchy in England, and the landing of Matilda. In 1141, Matilda won a

decisive victory at Lincoln, and for a few days London accepted her as sovereign; but when she declined to guarantee to the citizens the laws of Edward, and asked for a subsidy, London drove her out, and again declared for Stephen. It was not until 1154 that the civil war was ended by a compromise which granted the kingdom of England to Stephen for life with reversion to Matilda's son Henry. In 1155 Stephen died and Henry II. succeeded to the throne.

The reign of Stephen is generally regarded as nineteen years of anarchy, vividly pictured by the monkish historian, who has left a terrible record of the condition of the country districts of England in Stephen's reign. "When the traitors perceived that he was a mild man, and soft, and good, and did no justice, then did they all wonder. They had done homage to him, and sworn oaths, but held no faith; they were all forsworn and forfeited their troth; for every powerful man made his castles and held them against him; and they filled the land full of castles. They cruelly oppressed the wretched men of the land with castle works. When the castles were made they filled them with devils and evil men. Then took they those men that they imagined had any property, both by night and by day, peasant men and women, and put them in prison for their gold and silver and tortured them with unutterable tortures; for never were martyrs so tortured as they were . . . The bishops and clergy constantly cursed them, but nothing came of it; for they were all accursed, and forsworn, and lost. However a man tilled, the earth bare no corn, for the land was all fordone by such

deeds; and they said openly that Christ and His saints slept. Such and more than we can say we endured nineteen winters for our sins."

Here is a picture of what the magnates could do when the royal power was weak and the Church unable to protect the peasant from his lord. Froude has described the imperfections of the ecclesiastical courts; he has laid stress on the mildness of their punishments, which often allowed the guilty to escape, and has shown that civil law was much more consonant with modern ideas. But the Chronicler gives the other side of the picture. The condition of England in the twelfth century bears little or no resemblance to the present condition of England. The parish priest might be, and usually was, the son of a serf. Once in holy orders he was free of his lord, and could excommunicate the oppressor of his peasant kinsfolk. The peasant had no defender but the Church. She was to him his one sure refuge. Rome was far away and her claim to overlordship was not felt. Peter's Pence was a small price to pay for protection against a feudal lord. The magnate was very near, and he had little sympathy with the race his father had conquered.

In striking contrast to the picture drawn by the Chronicler is one left by FitzStephen, a citizen of London, of that great city in the reign of Henry II. To the north were cornfields, pastures, and meadows producing luxuriant crops, and beyond these was a great forest filled with game, stags, bucks, boars and wild bulls. The citizens were distinguished for their manners, their dress, and their good fare. From the most distant lands ships came bringing luxuries of

all kinds to the port. FitzStephen wrote that London was able to supply twenty thousand horse and sixty thousand foot when King Stephen called for a muster of the citizens. He described with pride the schools of London and the amusements of the Londoners. The wealthy indulged in hawking and hunting, pastimes of kings and lords. He wrote that the dwellers in London were called barons, not citizens. So great prosperity had followed from the protection of inland trade.

Both the Chronicler and FitzStephen appear to have been guilty of some exaggeration. It is certain that in many parts of England there was prosperity during Stephen's reign. It is known that during these nineteen years more abbeys were built than during the preceding century, and that these buildings were distinguished by the grace and exquisite beauty of their architecture. This was the period when the Cistercians came to England and covered Yorkshire with sheep farms. These monks were the greatest of sheep farmers, and the wool they produced became the most important part of England's chief export. In this reign also an Anglo-Flemish fleet sailed from Dartmouth to co-operate with the forces which marched overland on the Second Crusade in 1147. This fleet failed to reach the Mediterranean, but its sailors did some service by driving the Moors from Lisbon and helping to found the kingdom of Portugal. But, when the narratives are discounted, the strength of London and the weakness of the country districts are yet most marked features of Stephen's reign, and although London suffered from a great fire in 1136, it enjoyed

such prosperity that not long after Stephen's death it was described by a contemporary writer as one of the most flourishing towns in Christendom. The pride of London's citizens contrasts strangely with the meekness of the conquered peasantry of England. She claimed and maintained the right of making and unmaking kings. In London the fusion of Norman, Dane, and Saxon into Englishmen was being rapidly accomplished. She was an oasis of freedom in a conquered land, and the secret of her power, that which made her even stronger than the Church, was her wise protective policy which kept the home trade for her citizens.

## VI

### BECKET'S FIGHT FOR ENGLISH FREEDOM

1154-1189

HENRY II. devoted the first years of his reign to re-establishing the royal power in England. The royal lands, which Stephen had given to his Flemish supporters, were resumed by the Crown, and the foreign soldiers were expelled. The unlawful castles were demolished. Once more the King of Scotland and Prince of Wales became close allies, if not the actual vassals of England's King, and served in his army when he tried to annex Toulouse. From his father Henry inherited Anjou, and his marriage with Eleanor, Duchess of Aquitaine, made him ruler of lands which stretched to the Pyrenees, and were separated from the Mediterranean by the country of Toulouse, which he attacked in 1159.

Had he become master of Toulouse, Henry would have owned a through way to the East by Bordeaux and the Garonne. Louis VII. of France, however, came to the aid of the threatened county, and Henry abandoned his scheme.

This cautious policy was probably a wise one. Count Thierry of Flanders was Henry's friend. He

had recently entrusted the guardianship of Flanders and of his young son to Henry when he paid a visit to the Flemish settlements in the East. In 1157 Flanders fought with Holland over a trade dispute; and the Flemish would have felt the opening of a new trade route to the Mediterranean. An open breach with Flanders and France was avoided for some years, which gave Henry time to consolidate and increase his possessions in Western France and in the British Isles. Brittany was drawn into his sphere of influence, and a papal bull was obtained which authorised the conquest of Ireland. In the full tide of his success the King determined to limit the freedom of the Church of England, and in 1162 he made Thomas Becket Archbishop of Canterbury, believing that he could rely upon one who had faithfully served him as Chancellor. But the new Archbishop was the son of Gilbert Becket, formerly portreeve of London, and in a Londoner born and bred the greatest monarch of Western Europe found the man who made him miss his destiny.

Henry summoned a Great Council, and the bishops and barons accepted a code of laws called the Constitutions of Clarendon, which, amongst other provisions, would have enabled the King to shield the greater barons and royal servants from excommunication, would have empowered the civil courts to punish the clergy, and would have prevented the son of a serf from becoming a priest without his lord's consent. Becket was the first of the new English to rise to the dignity of Archbishop of Canterbury. His colleagues came from the class whose ancestors had subdued England. They were ready to obey the King's will,

and the Englishman was deserted and alone. For a moment Becket faltered. Then, supported only by the love of the poor of England, he began the fight which ended with his murder in 1170. Becket fled from England in 1164, but he maintained his cause in poverty and exile. There was at the time a schism in the papacy, and Pope Alexander, who was acknowledged by the West, was also a fugitive in France. Becket's quarrel embarrassed Alexander, and the Archbishop obtained very lukewarm support from his Pope. But Becket resolutely trod the path of duty to the English serfs who had been entrusted to his care. The path had a glorious ending when the four Norman knights murdered the unarmed English Archbishop in the Cathedral of Canterbury. Becket's ancestors were possibly as foreign as those of his murderers, but London had taught him to die for English rights and liberty. The modern reader is tempted to misunderstand the great issue for which Becket lived and died. The principles for which he fought—the freedom of the clergy from the law of the State and the right of appeal to Rome—continued to exist long after they ceased to be of service to the English. In time both principles became anachronisms and abuses. There is, therefore, a temptation to regard Henry as the originator of reform and Becket as its opponent. But this view finds little support in the verdict pronounced by the English in the twelfth century. They regarded Becket as the champion of the rights of the poor against the tyranny of the rich. In London, the centre of English freedom, St. Thomas the Martyr was greatly honoured. "For many years after his death it was the custom of

the mayor of the City for the time being, upon entering into office, to meet the aldermen at the Church of St. Thomas of Acon . . . and thence to proceed to the tomb of Gilbert Becket, the father, in St. Paul's Churchyard, there to say a De Profundis, after which both mayor and aldermen returned to the Church of St. Thomas, and, each having made an offering of two pence, returned to his own home." Londoners evidently believed that the portreeve had taught his son to live and die for English freedom.

The miracles wrought by St. Thomas point in the same direction. The saint was never weary of showing kindness to peasant children. The eyes of the thief, destroyed by the cruel law of the State, were restored by the martyr. The marriage of parish priests had been forbidden in the days of Anselm ; but St. Thomas, though Rome had made him saint, took the illegal home circle of the English parish priest under his peculiar care. The English, at least, did not associate the memory of the man who had withstood both King and Pope with undue subservience to Rome. That Henry did good service to England by continuing the policy of his grandfather none can doubt. He furthered the unification of Great Britain and the establishment of the supremacy of the King's law. From his reforms the English jury grew. But Becket's great work was to force the King to ally himself with the people instead of with his magnates. After Becket's death Henry continued his reforms ; but he tried to harmonise the increase of royal power with the interests of the English.

Six months before Becket's death the King's

eldest son, Prince Henry, was crowned King of England. In the same year "a clean sweep was made of the corrupt local sheriffs, and royal officials substituted." In 1171 Henry took formal possession of Ireland, which some of his magnates had already invaded. In May 1172 he was solemnly forgiven for his share in Becket's murder and reconciled to the Church. Prince Henry was again crowned in 1172; and at the same time the King tried to settle the affairs of his vast empire by delegating authority over provinces to his other sons. To Richard was given Aquitaine, to Geoffrey Brittany, whilst a marriage was arranged for John which would have made him lord of valuable fiefs in Provence. The Count of Toulouse was then induced to accept Henry as suzerain. It was a moment of triumph which preceded a storm.

Count Philip, who had succeeded to Flanders in 1168, joined Louis VII. in opposing Henry. David of Scotland and a number of discontented barons also took arms with the object of making Prince Henry King of England in fact as well as in name. When the wool trade was disturbed it was not difficult to enlist an army of unemployed Flemish weavers. The men poured into England saying, according to a contemporary historian, "We have not come into this country to sojourn, but to destroy King Henry the old warrior, and to have his wool, which we long for." The historian adds: "Lords, that is the truth: the greater part of them were weavers." Throughout the graphic narrative of Jordan Fantosme these Flemings play an important part. The war was one in which the English fought an allied army of Scotchmen and Flemings.

When the Bishop of Winchester carried grave news to the King, who was holding his own with some difficulty in Normandy, " ' Fair lord,' said the King, ' tell me the truth, how are the brave men of my city of London acting ? ' " The answer to this question was : " ' They are the most loyal people of all your kingdom. There is no one in the town who is of age to bear arms who is not well armed. You would wrongly believe any evil of them.' ' O God,' so said the King, ' now have pity, preserve the brave men of my city of London. Depart, lord bishop, to your country. If God give me health, and I be alive, you will have me in London before fifteen days are past, and I will take vengeance on all my enemies.' "

To make assurance doubly sure the King, on his way to London, walked barefoot to the shrine of St. Thomas at Canterbury, and was scourged by the monks. Reconciled thus to his English subjects Henry had a royal reception when he reached London. A few days later he received news of the defeat and capture of the King of Scotland. It was not long before the Flemings were expelled from England ; and civil war did not disturb England during the rest of Henry's reign. But he had trouble enough in his continental dominions. Men sought peace then as at all times they have sought peace. War is always uncomfortable ; and to Flemish weavers who had been taught that they could not obtain Henry's wool by force, peace with England was absolutely necessary. But the divergent economic interests of the provinces of Henry's empire made a prolonged peace impossible. In 1174 all differences appeared to have been adjusted.

The western peoples sheathed their swords, and the King of Scotland was released when he had fully acknowledged Henry as his suzerain.

In 1179 Louis of France was stricken with paralysis, and his son, Philip II., became the ruler of France. He married the niece of the childless Count Philip of Flanders, who was made regent of France during the minority of Philip II. During this peace a curious presentiment of fast approaching war prompted the Flemish, French and English to make ready for battle. In 1181, by the Assize of Arms, every English freeman was bound to be prepared to defend his country in case of need. Similar edicts were simultaneously promulgated in France and Flanders. The hold which Henry had acquired over his English subjects by his reconciliation with St. Thomas was shown when he bade his English furnish themselves with arms. The later years of Henry's life were full of the trouble inseparable from his vast possessions on the Continent. Richard gave expression to the desire of those over whom he ruled in Aquitaine for independence and access to the Mediterranean through Toulouse. This brought him into conflict with Prince Henry, who wished to succeed to an undivided empire. For reasons of his own the French King encouraged these disputes amongst Henry's sons, which continued after Prince Henry's death in 1183, and that of his brother Geoffrey in 1186. Jerusalem was captured by the Turks in 1187; and the Kings of the West agreed to forget their differences and join in the Third Crusade. But before arrangements could be made war began again over the seizure of merchants from Richard's

dominions by the Count of Toulouse. England and France became involved in the quarrel. Henry was unsuccessful in the fighting, and lost the town of Le Mans. He died soon after peace was signed in 1189, cursing his children and his God because he had failed to unite lands whose economic interests were opposed to union.

## VII

### ENGLAND ACQUIRES NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

1190–1226

THREE rulers led the Third Crusade; of these the first to take the cross and the most enthusiastic was Richard I., King of England, who had but recently been ruling over Aquitaine. Since England's foreign trade was conducted by aliens, the expedition was not conceived in the interest of England; but the merchants of Aquitaine might have gained had it been a success. With Richard, the two Philips of Flanders and of France went on crusade in 1190. An Anglo-Flemish fleet sailed in advance of the main expedition, and devoted some time to attacking the Moors and driving them from Southern Portugal. The Christian kings who ruled over the provinces into which the Spanish peninsula was divided were gaining importance in the eyes of the Western rulers; since they commanded the gateway to the golden East. Eleanor, daughter of Henry II., married the King of Castile. A Portuguese princess became the wife of Philip of Flanders; and, whilst the Crusaders rested in the island of Sicily, Richard married Berengaria of Navarre.

The cordial relations which united France and Flanders were of short duration. Territorial disputes

led to war by which Philip of France increased his possessions at the expense of his namesake of Flanders. The alliance of the Third Crusade was supposed to have reconciled the three leaders. It needed, however, no gift of prophecy to see that France was destined to increase at the expense of England and Flanders, unless the English and Flemish formed a close alliance. But, although the industrial interests and racial sympathies of the English and Flemish made for this alliance, the commercial ambition of the Flemish merchants and those of Aquitaine led their rulers to waste strength in distant conquests and neglect the treasure they possessed in the wool of England and the looms of Flanders.

The crusading kings quarrelled over the conquests that were made. When Cyprus was taken, Philip of France asked for half of the island, and was told by Richard that he could not have it unless he promised to divide Flanders. It was thus clearly understood that the Flemish were to be the real victims of the Third Crusade. Shortly before the Crusaders captured the seaport of Acre, Philip of Flanders died, and, after a brief interval, Philip of France left the East, bent on increasing his possessions at the expense of the new Count. But news of the death travelled faster than the King; and Count Baldwin VIII. was allowed to succeed after surrendering Artois and paying a large fine. Richard, dazzled by the prospect of capturing Jerusalem, remained in the East. But in October 1192 the intrigues of his brother John with the French King compelled Richard to abandon his design and leave the East. On his journey home Richard was

seized by the Germans and the English paid an enormous ransom for their King. On his return Richard plunged into war with France. In 1195 Baldwin VIII. was succeeded by his son Baldwin IX., a young man twenty-three years of age. Philip took advantage of the young Count's inexperience, obtaining from him the fiefs of Boulogne and Guines ; in other words, access to the coast nearest to England. Baldwin IX. also signed papers requesting certain bishops to excommunicate him if he failed in his duty towards his suzerain.

The indignation of the Flemish at this peaceful annexation, which would have imperilled their commerce with England in the event of an Anglo-French war, was so great that Baldwin was forced to alter his policy. In 1197 the Flemish concluded an offensive and defensive alliance with England and engaged in war with France. The allies were meeting with great success in the war when Richard died in 1199. John became ruler of the Angevin Empire, although many of his subjects supported the claim of Arthur, son of Geoffrey of Brittany, to the Crown. The allied powers, England and Flanders, were able to make satisfactory treaties with France in 1200. John's reign might have been a successful one but for the Fourth Crusade.

There was a curious mixture of physical courage and moral cowardice in the Flemish character. Whilst they retained many of their pagan superstitions, they were paralysed when Flanders was placed under interdict and Christian services were forbidden. The Archbishop of Rheims placed Flanders under interdict during the war between Baldwin IX. and Philip II.,

but the Pope removed the interdict. Gratitude to the Pope may have prompted Baldwin to march to the East in 1202 on the Fourth Crusade; but for this, as for the other Crusades, there were other than religious motives. Instead of fighting the infidel, the Venetians and Flemish seized and sacked Constantinople, the greatest commercial city in Europe and the bulwark of Christianity in the East. When, in defiance of the Pope's commands, this crime was committed in 1204 and the Count of Flanders became Emperor of Constantinople, the merchants of Flanders had reason to hope that the Flemish had secured a monopoly of trade with the East.

The Flemish learned their mistake when within a year their Count lost his life fighting Bulgarians. The fortunes of Flanders then depended upon two young girls, Jean and Marguerite, doubly orphaned since their mother, Count Baldwin's wife, had died of fever on board a Flemish fleet which was lying off the coast of Syria. It was long before the Flemish could believe that their great speculation had ended in disaster. More than twenty years after Baldwin's death an impostor was hanged for leading all Flanders astray by pretending to be the Emperor miraculously restored to a people who longed for his return. Philip II. as suzerain of Flanders at once took possession of the Flemish heiresses, and the people were unable to be of assistance to the English whilst Jean and Marguerite were in Paris under Philip's control.

When Flanders was drained of her fighting men, John was summoned to Philip's court at Paris over a feudal dispute, and his continental fiefs were forfeited

to Philip. Whilst Baldwin was winning an empire in the East, Philip took possession of Normandy almost without resistance. The provinces of an empire cannot continue to be patriotic when their interests are systematically neglected. England's continental possessions had caused heavy taxation, while Normandy had been often devastated by wars waged in the interests of the merchants of Aquitaine. More English wool was sold to Flanders than to Normandy, and the Norman wine trade must have been affected when Gascony was united to England. The wine which the Normans sent to England came from central France. Their trade as middlemen would suffer when Paris and Rouen were separated by Château Gaillard, which Richard I. built on the banks of the Seine. It was but natural that the separation of England and Normandy caused little emotion in either land.

John, however, did not view with unconcern the loss of revenue and prestige which came from his continental possessions. The basin of the Loire, as well as the basin of the Seine, had seceded from John's empire. The only continental possession which remained to him was the favoured region of the Garonne. John showed great ability in grappling with his difficulties, although in the end force of circumstances proved stronger than he. He established precedents which were afterwards followed by his more fortunate successors. The wool-growing Cistercians claimed exemption from national taxation on the ground that they were not English but foreigners settled in England. John declared that if those who lived in England would not contribute to the expense of government they

should not have the protection of English law. This quarrel led to a conflict between Church and State; during this conflict England was under interdict and the usual religious services were suspended from March 1208 until July 1214. The see of Canterbury fell vacant in 1205. The Pope, asked to decide between the candidates of the King and of the monks of Canterbury, gave Canterbury to his own nominee, Stephen Langton. John refused to allow Langton to enter England, so that for some years the Church had no leader.

In the midst of his many difficulties John proved himself a great ruler of men. While England was suffering under interdict, a sentence which had humbled his great rival, Philip of France, in less than a year, John was able to exercise greater authority over both Great Britain and Ireland than any of his predecessors. His private character is described as infamous, but he was loyally obeyed. His throne was supported by a foreign mercenary army recruited largely in Flanders. But the burden of taxation fell lightly on the English, since John confiscated the property of the Church and thus obtained ample funds. During the minority of Countess Jean, the King of England entered into direct relations with the burghers of the Flemish towns. Thus London's wool trade did not suffer. This precedent was also followed by England's kings.

There was a strong Flemish party opposed to union with France; but, whilst the Countess of Flanders was in Philip's keeping, a new crusade drained Flanders of her fighting men. In the rich and prosperous county of Toulouse there were many who held views

now generally accepted by Protestants. Against these men, who denied the authority of the Pope, Rome preached a new crusade. Before Flanders had time to gather strength after the Fourth Crusade, in 1208 her feudal lords joined those of Northern France in an attack on Toulouse. Urged on by the fiery St. Dominic and led by Simon de Montfort, who by this act forfeited his English earldom of Leicester, an army devastated Toulouse, shouting, as they indiscriminately slew orthodox and heretics, "Kill all; the Lord will know His own." This was the first of the invasions which determined the fate of Toulouse. Henceforward the land was open to the French invader. In 1229 it was finally annexed to the possessions of St. Louis, King of France.

As soon as they had recovered from the madness of the Crusade against Toulouse, the Flemish threatened that they would seek a protector in King John if their Countess was not restored to them. In 1212 she was married to Ferdinand of Portugal, who bound himself to act as the faithful servant of Philip II. But the national feeling of the Flemish forced the Count to form an alliance with John. War between France and the allied powers of England and Flanders was inevitable. The shipping of Normandy had become French. If to this was added the fleet of Flanders a successful invasion was more than probable. The English who had refused to help John to retain his continental possessions came forward with enthusiasm when their island was threatened. But the Flemish alliance was the weak point which John feared.

The English had shown that interdict could not

conquer them, but its effect on the Flemish was well known. In January 1213, John, who had already been excommunicated, was formally deposed, and Philip was authorised by the Pope to invade England. It then became certain that Flanders would have to abandon her English ally or brave the anger of Rome, unless John made terms with the Pope. In May 1213, when the French army was about to embark for England, John yielded. With the consent of his barons, he acknowledged the Pope as his suzerain, and England became a vassal kingdom. Langton and the exiled bishops came to England. Compensation was promised to the Church, and Philip was forbidden to attack Rome's vassal. Under these circumstances the Flemish had to be crushed before it was safe for the French to cross the Channel.

Philip's army at once invaded Flanders, and his fleet sailed to Damme, where it blocked the entrance to Bruges. John acted promptly. In less than three weeks after his submission to the Pope, an English fleet destroyed or captured four hundred French ships in the harbour of Damme. This was the first of England's victories on the sea. With the destruction of the French fleet all danger of an invasion of England passed away; but Philip continued his attack on Flanders. When John tried to aid his allies, his magnates refused their help. It was not until February 1214 that John was able to sail for La Rochelle with few followers but with money to pay foreign recruits. Meanwhile the Flemish had been placed under interdict by French bishops, and, in despair, they joined a great confederation, which included the

excommunicated Emperor of Germany, Otto IV. John's attack on Anjou was successful mainly because Philip refused to be diverted from his campaign against Flanders and her allies. In July 1214, at Bouvines, the French King won a decisive victory. Count Ferdinand was taken prisoner ; Flanders was crushed ; and John was compelled to make peace with Philip by abandoning his lost continental dominions.

On his return to England John was confronted by a combination of bishops, lords, and merchants. They demanded the Great Charter which John signed at Runnymede in June 1215. This Charter left the English serf in bondage, but John was forced to promise to observe the feudal obligations which were implied in the Charter of Henry I. Thus, whilst the Great Charter is mainly feudal, it safeguarded the rights of all classes of free Englishmen. When the feudal lords made common cause with ecclesiastics and merchants, the new English nation was born. A halo of romance grew round the Great Charter, so that in time men came to believe that the principles of trial by jury and of free trade were contained in it. But this belief is not shared by modern students of history.

Henry II. established juries of accusation—parents of the modern grand jury—which sent those they deemed guilty to the ordeal. The accused was then punished if he failed to hold hot iron unharmed or sink when thrown into water. It was a form of appeal to God after man had given his decision. In 1215 the Fourth Lateran Council condemned ordeals, and forbade priests to countenance them. After this the petty jury replaced the ordeal ; but the change was

not connected with the Great Charter. Nor did the Great Charter sanction free trade. London merchants would never have assented to so revolutionary a change. Chapter XIII. promises "that the citizens of London shall have all their ancient liberties and free customs as well by land as by water; furthermore, we decree and grant that all other cities, boroughs, towns, and ports shall have all their liberties and free customs."

Chapter XLI. decrees that "all merchants shall have safe and secure exit from England, and entry to England, with the right to tarry there and to move about as well by land as by water, for buying and selling by the ancient and right customs, except (in time of war) such merchants as are of the land at war with us. And if such are found in our land at the beginning of the war, they shall be detained, without injury to their bodies or goods, until information be received by us, or by our chief justiciar, how the merchants of our land found in the land at war with us are treated; and if our men are safe there, the others shall be safe in our land." The inland trade was fully protected by the "ancient and right customs," and it was endangered when the King arbitrarily interfered, as John had often done, with the coming and going of foreign merchants. But even this chapter was found to be injurious to the interests of the nation; and, in subsequent confirmations of the Charter, the Crown was allowed to suspend its operation by proclamation.

In the Charter John promised to send away his foreign mercenaries. At first he fulfilled his promise. Then the Pope released him from his oath, and he not

only recalled those he had sent away but enlisted more in Flanders. A multitude of Flemish, anxious to escape from French rule, sailed for England. Many were wrecked off the east coast, but a sufficient number landed there and at Dover to spread panic throughout England. The fleet and the Cinque Ports remained faithful to John. Before long the barons had practically lost all the land except London. In their extremity they offered the kingdom to Louis, the son and heir of Philip of France. John died in October 1216 during the civil war, six months after the death of Innocent III., his papal suzerain. England's new suzerain, Honorius III., reaped from England the harvest which Innocent sowed.

John's son and heir, Henry III., was nine years old in 1216. The papal legate at once received the boy's homage and placed him under papal protection. Philip could not officially recognise his son's claim to the English throne, and in 1217 Louis returned to France. There was peace between England and France until Philip died in 1223 and his son became Louis VIII. During Philip's life Count Ferdinand remained in a French prison. It was not until Henry III. had officially recognised the impostor who pretended that he was Baldwin of Constantinople, when it also seemed probable that the Pope would annul Jean's marriage and thus allow her to choose another protector, that, in 1226, Ferdinand was released. Whilst their French suzerain was exercising an ever-increasing influence over the rulers of Flanders the Kings of England began to negotiate directly with the weaving cities of Flanders; and this policy was continued when, after Ferdinand's

release, Henry III. also paid the Count his traditional English annuity by way of ensuring an Anglo-Flemish cordial understanding.

The reign of Henry III. marks the transition from the purely feudal government by foreign kings to the mixed feudal and commercial government by the first national Kings of England since the Conquest. A new era then began in which England gradually learned to value and ultimately to protect the production of her workers as well as the trade of her merchants. During this era many mistakes were made, and there was a great crisis—the War of the Roses—which ushered in the protection of industry in much the same way as the War of the Barons led to the entrance of the mercantile class into the governing body of England. But in spite of mistakes and wars it is easy to trace a steady growth of freedom. Serfdom disappeared, and, as the people became free, they obtained from their rulers that protection for their labour without which their freedom would have been worthless.

## VIII

### THE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE ASSERTED BY A PROTECTIONIST

1218–1265

ORIGINALLY royal revenue was derived from land. Domesday Book was written by order of the Conqueror in order to equalise and facilitate the collection of this revenue. In ordinary times the King was supposed to live of his own; that is, from the rents of the crown estates, supplemented by prises levied in kind on exports and imports, payments made by the Jews in return for royal protection, and certain feudal dues. On extraordinary occasions the King's needs were supplied by special taxes. When he went on circuit the localities visited had to supply his wants. This right of purveyance was often grossly abused. During war the King's vassals were obliged to come to his aid, and he could take shipping or goods at a fixed price. It was also the duty of vassals to contribute towards the cost of knighting the king's eldest son, marrying his eldest daughter, and ransoming his person from the enemy. The Danegeld, or general tax on land, could be levied if there was need, and the coast towns could be required to provide ships for England's defence. After the reign of Henry II. the most usual

form of special tax was a fraction of the agricultural and other products which remained for sale after the wants of the producer were satisfied.

In theory all the land of England belonged to the King. In practice he only owned certain royal estates, whilst he had valuable rights over large tracts of country called forests. Dwellers within the forests were subject to a special code of laws. The game belonged to the King; and owners of land within the forests were not allowed to cut more timber than they required for their own use. The King owned the right of selling wood from the forest. Before coal was used as fuel the royal forests served a useful purpose in preserving the timber required for the navy. At first the King's forest rights were maintained by cruel laws, but these were abolished before the reign of Henry III. Fines or imprisonment for a year and a day were the later penalties inflicted for breaches of the forest law. Within the forests the poor enjoyed valuable rights of free fuel and pasture; but the richer landowners objected to laws which prevented them from selling timber or killing game. When lands were disafforested property of great value passed from the King, who represented the nation, into private hands. The anarchy of Stephen's reign led to encroachments on the royal forests. Much land was afforested by Henry II. and his sons. The long quarrel between King and magnates began as a dispute over the legality of these afforestations. It was ended in the nineteenth century, when the rights of the people in the royal forests had almost disappeared.

In Henry's reign there were two parties in England,

Nationalists and anti-Nationalists. The former included the majority of the English people, who viewed with pleasure the loss of Normandy and England's continental possessions. The latter, though numerically weak, were constantly strengthened by immigrants from the Continent. Their aim was the recovery of the Angevin Empire, and, perhaps, the acquisition of the through route to the East by way of the Garonne. From the first the anti-Nationalists had great influence over Henry III. The Nationalists were not united, some wished to increase the power of the magnates at the expense of the Crown; whilst others sought to unify the country by strengthening the King's authority. William Marshall, Earl of Pembroke, acted as Regent for the boy-king. He conciliated the magnates by advising Henry to sign the Great Charter and the Charter of the Forests, which sanctioned extensive disafforestations. Pembroke died in 1218. He was succeeded by Hubert de Burgh, a Nationalist who worked for the Crown. The Pope's attempt to govern England as a subject province was foiled by his efforts and those of Archbishop Langton; but the papacy was able to treat England as a well of wealth from which Rome could draw an unlimited supply.

Under de Burgh order was re-established. In 1222 he incurred the hostility of the Londoners by his severity in suppressing a local riot which, owing to the cries raised, appeared like an attempt at again asserting Louis' claim to the throne of England. In 1223 Philip of France died and his son became Louis VIII. Henry was in this year declared of age, and the surrender of royal castles held during the King's minority

was demanded. There was a short civil war, after which de Burgh was able to strengthen the royal power. War with France recommenced in 1224. The English possessions in Gascony were retained, owing to the fact that the French directed most of their attention to the complete subjugation of Toulouse. In 1226, whilst Toulouse was being crushed, Louis VIII. died. His twelve-year-old son became Louis IX. with his mother Blanche of Castile as Regent.

The accession of a child to the throne of France gave the French feudal lords an opportunity for checking the growth of their suzerain's authority, which had been greatly increased by Philip II. and Louis VIII. Henry tried to turn this disunion to good account, but the tact of the Regent of France conciliated the French barons for a time, and Henry was forced to make a truce with France in 1228. The French barons, however, insisted that Ferdinand of Flanders should be released so that the Flemish had a man to lead them. In 1229 the question of Toulouse was finally settled by its definite union with the kingdom of France. Next year the barons of France were again in arms against the Regent; and Henry crossed the Channel. But, in spite of his annuity, the Count of Flanders refused to join the insurgent French barons. The Regent was able to make terms with the barons; and Henry signed a fresh truce with France.

The position of the Count of Flanders was a difficult one. Over a part of his territory the French King was over-lord; part was held as a German fief; and some land was his own domain. In the time of William the Conqueror, a fresh obligation was added: in return for

an annual money payment, the Counts entered into complicated feudal relations with the kings of England. As Dukes of Normandy, the English kings were vassals of France like the Flemish Counts; and the Anglo-Flemish treaties which for many years were enacted and re-enacted bear witness to the Counts' keen desire to live on the most friendly terms with England, and yet avoid giving offence to their suzerain, or compromising themselves with Normandy.

The war of 1230 was accompanied by a stoppage of commercial relations between England and Flanders. The inconvenience was evidently felt in both countries, since in 1237 an Anglo-Flemish arrangement was concluded which guaranteed the neutrality of Flanders in the event of an Anglo-French war. Nevertheless, although the Countess of Flanders married, after the death of Ferdinand in 1233, a husband who proved loyal to England and his annuity, the political connexion between France and Flanders still deprived Flemish looms of English wool when England and France were at war. A regular supply of English wool was so important to the weavers of Ghent that in the middle of the thirteenth century they made a canal connecting their city with Damme, a seaport at the mouth of the Zwyn.

Among those who volunteered for the war of 1230 there was one who was destined to mould the infant nation of England. A marriage contracted in the twelfth century between the Anglo-Norman house of de Beaumont and the Franco-Norman house of de Montfort gave the earldom of Leicester to that Simon de Montfort who led the Albigensian crusade.

In this crusade he was fighting against John's brother-in-law, the Count of Toulouse, and blocking the English king's access to the Mediterranean. He therefore forfeited his earldom; but his younger son, also called Simon, made amends when he offered his sword to Henry in 1230. As a reward Simon de Montfort received the forfeited earldom of Leicester and the hand of the king's sister, Eleanor, thus becoming one of the most important of England's magnates.

Henry III., a devoted servant of the Church of Rome, was unfortunate in the choice of two of his sisters' husbands. De Montfort was excommunicated by the Pope, and the same fate was shared by the Emperor Frederic II., who married Henry's sister Isabel in 1235. The war between Emperor and Pope culminated in Frederic's reign. The papacy needed money for this war and made repeated demands on its vassal kingdom, England. Papal financiers, called Caorsines, from Cahors, came to aid in the collection of this tribute. These Caorsines were soon hated as heartily as the Jews were. The English clergy were the chief victims. Not only were they heavily taxed, but the well-paid livings were given to foreigners. Papal taxation and that caused by the Anglo-French wars caused such discontent that in 1232 a vast secret society was formed in England to drive foreign ecclesiastics out of the island. Acts of violence were committed, and no one was arrested. Already de Burgh had lost Henry's favour owing to his having opposed the Anglo-French war. After these disturbances de Burgh was driven from office and persecuted by the

King. The anti-Nationalist des Roches became Henry's adviser, but his term of office was cut short by the outbreak of civil war. In 1234 Henry was forced to banish des Roches and govern England without an adviser.

Having obtained the right bank of the Rhone the French coveted the German fiefs which lined the left bank. The Count of Provence had no sons, and Louis IX. married the eldest of the Count's four daughters. In 1236 Henry III. married Eleanor of Provence, and the two remaining daughters found husbands in Charles of Anjou, the brother of Louis IX., and Richard of Cornwall, the brother of Henry III. Provence, the prize in this matrimonial contest, was ultimately obtained by Charles of Anjou. This was the beginning of the expansion of France at the expense of Germany. After Henry's wedding an attempt was made to reconcile the claims of the King and his magnates by an Act, called the Provisions of Merton, which was "framed in the interest of the great land-owners." The Great Charter and the Forest Charter were confirmed; but means were still found by which the disafforesting clauses were evaded. On the other hand, in the Provisions of Merton the lord of a manor was allowed "to enclose waste lands, provided that he left enough pasture to meet the wants of the free-holders." This method of satisfying the claims of the rich by assigning to them the rights of the poor formed a precedent often followed in later times.

With Henry's Queen there came a swarm of her kinsfolk from Provence. These were given posts in England; one of Queen Eleanor's uncles, Boniface,

obtained the Archbishopric of Canterbury in 1241. War broke out between Louis IX. and the Count of La Marche; and Henry III. invaded France in 1242, only once more to suffer defeat. A truce was then signed, and there were no more Anglo-French wars during Henry's reign. When they had access to the Mediterranean the French turned their attention to the East. The emperors who succeeded Count Baldwin at Constantinople were hard pressed. Baldwin II. came in person to ask for French aid in 1236. He received a large subsidy and gave in return a sacred relic. The Pope had begged Frederic II. to attack the Mahomedans, but the Emperor, who was also King of Sicily, found that he could obtain all he wanted by peaceful negotiation with the infidel. In 1248 Louis IX. sailed from Aigues Mortes, a Mediterranean seaport specially constructed by him. His invasion of Egypt ended in disaster. He was taken prisoner, but was allowed to sail to Acre after paying a ransom which emptied his military chest.

Henry III. also took the cross, and the Pope sanctioned a tax to be levied on the English clergy. But the English King left the fighting to Louis IX. In 1250 the Emperor Frederic died. With him the power of the empire passed away. The power of France increased as that of Germany declined. Henry III. also hoped to reap gain at the expense of Germany. In 1254 he concluded an offensive and defensive alliance with Alphonso, King of Castile—Edward, Henry's eldest son, was married to Eleanor, Alphonso's daughter. In the same year Henry accepted from the Pope the kingdom of Sicily for his second son, Edmund.

In 1256 Richard of Cornwall accepted an invitation to become the Emperor of Germany. To Henry it may have seemed that England would take that place in Europe which Germany had held. The English were indifferent to this dazzling future. They only saw with alarm that vast sums of English money were being sent to Rome and Germany. In 1258 the royal treasury was empty. The magnates were summoned to a Great Council at Westminster, and the crisis in the contest between the Nationalists and anti-Nationalists began.

At first the Nationalists were united in their action, but they were composed of two sections whose aims were antagonistic. A great movement had been started in the Catholic Church by the friars who followed the teaching of St. Dominic and St. Francis. Both taught that Christians should love righteousness more than worldly wealth, and both tried to reform the Church from within. Whatever may be said of the failings of the mendicant friars when they were overcome by the gold they had denounced, or whatever fault may be found with the acts of cruelty by which the Dominicans proved their fanatical loyalty to Rome, all must admire the Christlike self-surrender of the first Dominicans and Franciscans when they came penniless to England to minister to outcasts for whom nobody cared. At once this saintliness conquered England, and in all probability postponed the severance of the English Church from Rome for centuries. The Franciscan friars had taught the English that poor and rich were brethren in Christ, the friars practised the religion they preached, and the English gladly accepted

their Gospel; from them the English learned their first lessons in real freedom. Grossteste, one of the holiest of England's bishops, afterwards Bishop of Lincoln, welcomed the Franciscans to Oxford in 1224; he retained a close connexion with the Franciscans throughout his life. Grossteste and Adam Marsh, a Franciscan friar, were intimate friends of de Montfort and his wife. Some of the letters which passed between these friends have been preserved, and these breathe a spirit of devotion to Christ and His teaching. Under such teachers de Montfort became the leader of that section of the Nationalist party which aimed at securing freedom for all Englishmen; while Richard, Earl of Gloucester, led those magnates whose ideal of freedom meant the rule of the barons. The cleavage between the sections did not occur until the united Nationalist party had vanquished their opponents.

Behind the barons at the Great Council of Westminster there was a united people. The Church and London supported them, and the King had no option but to agree to a project of reform whose execution should be entrusted to twenty-four councillors to be chosen by himself and his magnates. The Great Council then adjourned to Oxford. There a Petition of Grievances was presented to the King. The barons complained of violation of the Charters, of defects in English law, of corrupt administration of justice, of the power which Henry had entrusted to foreigners, and of the foreign merchants and money-lenders who were allowed to reside and trade in London without contributing to national taxation. A council of fifteen members was then appointed, and the King swore that

he would act as they advised. The royal proclamation accepting the Provisions of Oxford was published in English, as well as in French and Latin. In the struggle for freedom the Londoners took a prominent part. Freeman has written that, in 1247, "when the nobles, clergy, and people of England put forth their famous letter denouncing the wrongs which England suffered at the hands of the Roman bishop, it was with the seal of the city of London, as the centre of national life, that the national protest was made." But London, like the barons, was destined, as the struggle developed, to be weakened by strife between the democratic and the anti-democratic Nationalists.

After the triumph of the Nationalists at Oxford the foreign policy of England was reversed. The crown of Sicily was declined and the Anglo-French truce was converted into a formal peace. The principles of the Provisions of Oxford were elaborated in detail by the Provisions of Westminster passed by the barons in 1259. The rights which the great landlords demanded from their chief landlord, the King, were given to their tenants. A genuine attempt was made at establishing a constitutional monarchy. If on the one hand the King was asked to govern by the advice of his barons, on the other hand the power of the King, acting under advice, was increased by the baronial surrender of feudal privileges. Although de Montfort's scheme of a constitutional monarchy failed, the King when triumphant in 1267 re-enacted the Provisions of Westminster in the Statute of Marlborough. The failure of de Montfort's scheme was due, not to his legal reforms, but to a vast economic

28980

change which he tried to carry out while he was engaged in political reform.

Economic and political independence are closely allied. It is not wise to depend solely on the sale of raw material to the foreigner, since in times of shortage the people have no manufactures to sell for food, and the land may be afflicted with famine. It is equally unwise to trust to an industry which depends on foreign raw material, since ruin must come if the foreign nation acquires the industry and thus uses her raw material at home. These truths are clearly expressed in the histories of England and Flanders.

In all countries peasants wove the rough cloth which served their needs, but the finer cloths of European manufacture were, at first, made almost exclusively in Flanders. Weaving was introduced into that country as a definite industry long before the coming of William I. to England. At a later date the Flemish had serious competitors in Southern Germany and Florence ; but for a long while England was the country where the wool was grown, Flanders the land where it was made into fine cloth, and German merchants the middlemen who bought and sold the wool and cloth. It was part of the policy of the Norman and Angevin kings to encourage these foreign middlemen, and for many centuries English commerce was restricted to buying in the home market and selling to the German for export abroad. Lead, tin, hides, and wool were England's principal exports, particularly wool, which was chiefly sold in Flanders.

In 1258 the barons at Oxford " decreed that the wool of the country should be worked up in England,

and should not be sold to foreigners, and that every one should use woollen cloth made within the country and not seek over-precious raiment." This attempt at protecting the work of the poor English weaver instead of the trade of the rich English merchant was in keeping with the idealism of the Franciscan friars. It was, at the time, Utopian and visionary. Though woad was imported in considerable quantity, English cloth was for the most part undyed and rough. The weaving industry in England was too small to absorb the immense supply of English wool. Had the decree been carried out, the merchants and wool-growers of England would have been faced with ruin. The mayor and aldermen of London accepted the Provisions of Oxford "saving the liberties and customs of the City"; but there were many who objected to this saving clause. The Craft Gilds united, and in 1261 they elected a democratic mayor, FitzThomas. Thus the suggestion of protection for English industry led at once to disunion in London. De Montfort appears to have yielded to the wishes of the merchants; since in 1259, when Henry was acting under baronial control, he signed agreements which encouraged Anglo-Flemish trade.

The barons were also disunited by de Montfort's democratic sympathies. Richard of Gloucester abandoned the baronial cause, and in 1261 Henry felt strong enough to produce papal bulls absolving him from his oath to observe the Provisions of Oxford. But whilst merchants and lords deserted the cause of democracy, the Church of England remained loyal to the cause of progress in defiance of the papal bulls.

The repudiation of the Provisions for a time reunited de Montfort and Gloucester. The Royalists suggested that the dispute between King and barons should be submitted to the arbitration of Louis IX. This was accepted by many of the barons, but de Montfort refused to assent and retired to France.

The death of Richard of Gloucester in 1262 weakened the Royalists. The new Earl Gilbert joined de Montfort, who returned from France in 1263. A baronial army swept through England and eventually received a warm welcome in London. Foreigners in England, particularly foreign clergy, were attacked and expelled from the island. Archbishop Boniface sought safety in flight. But once more the triumph of the Nationalists was followed by their disunion. The Sicilian danger passed away in the summer of 1263, when the Pope revoked his grant to Prince Edmund in order that he might give the throne to Charles of Anjou. Before the end of the year Henry and de Montfort agreed to accept the arbitration of Louis IX. Six months later Louis decided in Henry's favour on all the disputed points. This award was immediately followed by civil war. At Lewes in May 1264 the Royalists were defeated, and Henry became de Montfort's prisoner.

Though by birth and marriage de Montfort might have aspired to usurp the Crown, no such disloyal attempt was made. Henry continued to reign, but he had to accept again the Provisions. The Queen escaped to France and raised an army for the invasion of England. A papal legate waited at Boulogne for a chance to enter England and pronounce the excom-

munication of the Nationalists. Entering into the growing commercial spirit of the age, the Pope forbade all commerce with England. De Montfort faced the situation with courage. He raised an army to guard the coast. He organised a fleet to sweep the narrow seas. He levied a tax of ten per cent. on the goods of laity and clergy. To those who prophesied England's ruin de Montfort said "that the inhabitants of England could live comfortably of their own without foreign trade"; and patriots wore rough English undyed cloth to show their love for England.

These details are recorded by Thomas Wykes, one of the two contemporary historians who opposed de Montfort's policy. To prove that de Montfort oppressed the people, Wykes says that prices rose, but he only quotes the rise in price of wax, wine, and pepper. These were the luxuries of the rich. When de Montfort and his Franciscan teachers thought of the people of England, their minds instinctively turned to the poor workers, not to the rich merchants and landlords. That the poor could live of their own is proved by the almost idolatrous veneration of de Montfort's memory, which came spontaneously from the English poor when the great earl was killed at Evesham during the so-called period of distress.

The stoppage of trade alienated the merchants and many of the lords; but the Church and the people remained true to England. In January 1265 the first real English Parliament met at Westminster. In this Parliament, practically summoned by an excommunicated earl, there were one hundred and twenty of the higher clergy and only thirty-two barons; but

with the Churchmen there sat two members from each shire and town. Of the thirty-two barons nine were Royalists and these were soon increased by seceders from the ranks of the Nationalists. Gilbert of Gloucester abandoned de Montfort, and London gave but a hesitating support in spite of the efforts of Fitz-Thomas and his friends. Civil war ensued. In August 1265 de Montfort and his followers were welcomed by the monks of Evesham. Next day he was surrounded by Prince Edward's army and realised that all was lost. "By the arm of St. James! they attack wisely; not of themselves but from me have they learned that method; let us commend our souls to God since our bodies are theirs," said the Earl of Leicester when he died for England.

The monks of Evesham buried in their abbey what remained of de Montfort's body after the victors had mutilated a corpse they no longer feared. To the tomb of the excommunicated earl, as to Becket's shrine, the English flocked to be healed of their ills. In spite of Pope and King the English called de Montfort St. Simon the Martyr. At Evesham the vanquished won the victory; since Edward learned more than the art of war from the uncle he defeated. From de Montfort King Edward I. learned to trust his people and rule wisely; and England learned from her great earl to value economic independence and political freedom so dearly that in time she was really able to live of her own. But two centuries had to elapse before the lesson was fully learned.

# IX

## THE MAGNATES LOSE THEIR DEMOCRATIC SYMPATHIES

### 1270–1325

THE death of de Montfort wrecked the democratic cause. The property of the insurgent barons was confiscated. London lost her civic rights; and her democratic mayor, FitzThomas, died in prison. The disinherited continued a hopeless fight against Prince Edward, who undertook the task of reducing England to obedience. After a time more moderate counsels prevailed. The barons were allowed to redeem their estates by the payment of heavy fines. Henry left the government in the hands of his son, who proved that he had learned much from de Montfort. In 1270 the work of pacification was so complete that Edward thought it safe to accept the cross from his father and leave England on crusade. Before he left, London was given her old freedom.

England's interest in the crusade was but slight. Charles of Anjou was King of Sicily; to extend French influence in the Mediterranean his brother, Louis IX., sailed for Tunis on his last crusade. Before he joined Louis, Prince Edward learned that the crusade had failed, that Louis was dead, and that his son, Philip III., had made peace with the infidel. Edward then sailed

to Acre, where Christians were fighting to keep their only remaining colony in Syria. Recalled to England in 1272 by alarming accounts of his father's health, Edward, on his return journey, visited Charles of Anjou in Sicily, where he could see for himself that Germany had ceased to be the leading European State. A French king ruled the island which had flourished under Frederic's care; and Frenchmen had taken from Germans the task of alternately protecting and attacking the papacy. Pope Gregory X., Edward's host at Orvieto, could tell his guest that Rome was sanctioning the termination of the imperial interregnum in Germany, hoping that the reconciliation of Pope and Emperor would stimulate the waning interest of Europe in the East and lead to a new crusade. But the contrast between the feeble remnant of Christians at Acre and the prosperous burghers of the North Italian cities, who gave the young king a royal reception, must have shown him that the growth of European industry had quenched all zeal for the crusades.

That Edward loved the old feudal world which was so rapidly changing is shown by his halting, on the way to Paris, to accept a challenge from the Count of Chalons. The King won great renown by unhorsing his opponent; and then, after paying feudal homage to his suzerain at Paris, he spent some time in settling his complicated feudal relations with his turbulent vassals of Aquitaine. But, even before the King returned to England, he had to give his serious attention to prosaic mercantile disputes which had been affecting Anglo-Flemish trade. In April 1274 Edward made the exportation of English wool a capital offence.

Stint of wool stopped the Flemish looms. On his return from Aquitaine he had a consultation with the Mayor of London in Paris; and then met Count Guy of Flanders, with whom he made a satisfactory commercial treaty. In August 1274 Edward had a warm welcome when he entered London.

Whether Edward did or did not fully realise that the production of the East was being eclipsed by that of the great manufacturing centres of Europe, there is no doubt that the call of the East sounded more faintly to him after his visit to Acre. The thirty-five years of Edward's reign were devoted to the establishment of an English parliament, in which the Commons were represented, to the definition of the respective rights of the King and the people, to securing access to the Flemish wool market, and to the unification of Great Britain. The last object was the one which was nearest Edward's heart; it was also the only one which he failed to achieve.

In 1275 the Parliament of Westminster passed a comprehensive statute codifying English law. At the request of the merchants the King's ancient right of prise was altered into a definite export duty on wool and leather, England's chief exports. A definite money payment was granted on each sack of wool and last of leather. The export duties were called the Ancient or Great Customs. When prices rose this fixed money payment injuriously affected the royal revenue and led to trouble; but it was an attempt at removing a cause of friction between the King and his subjects. These export duties, which enhanced the price of English wool in Flanders, gave a permanent, though

slight, protection to English weavers. Flemish cloth, when sold in the English market, was also burdened with the cost of carrying the wool to Flanders and the cloth to England. In 1278 a statute, Quo Warranto, was passed to compel barons to declare the grounds on which they claimed their feudal rights. The results of the inquiry were recorded so that no new rights could be acquired by custom.

In 1279 another statute, Mortmain, was passed to prevent English land from passing into the hands of the clergy without the King's consent. The change effected by the growth of manufacture in Europe is illustrated by this statute. Edward's father began his reign as a vassal of the Pope, although the papacy was engaged in its struggle with the imperial power; but Edward could pass laws, which at one time would have called forth excommunication and interdict, although Rome had vanquished her imperial rival. The papacy was, however, as seriously weakened as its former foe. The Church still retained her hold over agriculture; but, when fine cloth was worth eight times the wool from which it was woven, merchants became richer and more powerful than abbots. When kings, merchants, and artisans worked in concert, they could curb priests and barons. This was, however, not fully realised in England for two centuries after Edward's reign. If England was born at Runnymede, she was an infant until de Montfort and Edward taught her to speak. For two hundred years she learned, as a child learns, by painful experience. Then, under the Tudors, she began her royal career.

The Chronicler who wrote that Wales was in the

power of William the Conqueror probably meant little more than that Wales could not have offered serious resistance to his attack. The union of England and Wales was furthered by the settlement of Flemings at Pembroke under Henry I. The general disintegration of Stephen's reign weakened the connexion, which was re-established by Henry II. and John. The revolutions which produced the Great Charter and the Provisions of Oxford left Wales in a semi-independent position. By force of arms Edward I. united Wales to England, and cemented the union by giving his son the title of Prince of Wales.

The Scotch of the Lowlands were, like the English, a blend of Saxons, Danes, and Normans. Whatever meaning should be attached to the Chronicler's statement that William the Conqueror "also subjected Scotland to him by his great strength," it is certain that in 1175 the King of Scotland admitted the overlordship of Henry II. Richard I. sold his suzerain rights; but there remained an indefinite acknowledgment of the superiority of the English king. During the reign of Henry III. the royal families of England and Scotland became closely united. Alexander II. married Henry's sister, and Alexander III. married Henry's daughter. In 1286 Alexander III. died, leaving no direct heirs except the child Margaret, the Maid of Norway. Her premature death wrecked the hopes of a peaceful union which had been founded on her betrothal to Edward's heir. After Margaret's death in 1290, two Scotch barons of Norman descent, John Balliol and Robert Bruce, submitted their claims to the throne of Scotland to Edward's arbitration.

In 1292 Balliol became King John of Scotland, and at the same time he accepted Edward's over-lordship.

The Scotch, like the English, were growers of wool; they sold their wool in Flanders as the English did. When in the reign of Edward I., and again in the reign of Edward III., the union of Great Britain was apparently accomplished, the Scotch wool-growers found that union with England was immediately followed by the closure of the Flemish market. To Scotch sheep-farmers union with England came to mean financial ruin, while alliance with France ensured an open door in Flanders for their wool. This condition was not altered until the Flemish weaving industry was ruined by the development of English weaving. Then union with England became a popular policy in Scotland, and the union of Great Britain was peacefully accomplished. It is commonly asserted that the Scotch rebelled against Edward I. because King John of Scotland was summoned to answer charges brought by merchants in Edward's court; but this was an ordinary incident of the feudal relation. Edward was summoned to answer charges brought by French sailors to Philip's court in Paris, and admitted the validity of the summons by sending his brother to appear as his deputy. Such a grievance would not have destroyed the friendly relations between Scotland and England; whereas exclusion from the Flemish market affected every home in Scotland.

In 1293 rivalry between the seamen of Normandy and of the Cinque Ports led to a sea fight in which the Norman fleet was destroyed. Edward tried to avert war by sending his brother Edmund to Paris to

answer the charges brought against him in Philip's court and by acquiescing in the sequestration of six Gascon strongholds for a short period as atonement for the destruction of the Norman fleet. These castles were, however, retained by the French King and war became inevitable. There were Flemish ships in the French fleet, but Edward and Count Guy took immediate steps to secure the continuance of friendly commercial relations. In particular the Count of Flanders promised that trade between Scotland and Flanders should not be interrupted. A project of marrying Edward's heir to a daughter of Count Guy, which had previously been mooted and abandoned, was revived. In June 1294 the marriage treaty was signed. Then the French King intervened.

Edward knew that delay was dangerous. The magnates, including King John of Scotland, met in June 1294. War was unanimously agreed on, and money almost enthusiastically promised. The feudal levies were summoned to meet at Portsmouth in September. The national emergency forced the King to resort to unconstitutional methods of taxation. "Even before the June parliament he had seized all the wool of the merchants, releasing it only on the payment of from three to five marks on the sack; an impost which by some undescribed process received the legal consent of the owners of wool, and was prolonged to the end of the war. On July 4 he had seized and enrolled all the coined money and treasure in the sacristies of the monasteries and cathedrals. The assembled clergy were no doubt prepared for a heavy demand, when the King appeared in person, and after

apologising for his recent violence on the plea of necessity, asked for an aid." After some resistance the clergy submitted. The possessions of alien priories were also seized and small incomes were allotted to the clergy. This step checked the sending of money to the French Chapters, to whom the monasteries owed allegiance. Before the opposition of the clergy was overcome, Edward threatened to deprive them of the protection of the law.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, Robert of Winchelsey, was a Franciscan, and the earnestness with which he defended the possessions of the Church marks a change in the attitude of the friars towards worldly wealth. The Sicilian vespers occurred in 1282. Then the French in Sicily were exterminated by the natives. For a time the papacy was freed from French control, and Pope Boniface VIII. used this freedom to assert again an extreme view of papal rights. In spite of the Act of Mortmain large sums were sent to Rome from England and also from France. Boniface determined that the Anglo-French war should not affect this tribute; and Winchelsey supported his Pope. The spirit of de Montfort seemed to live only in King Edward. The Church tried to evade taxation. The barons used the King's difficulties as a means by which they could force the surrender of the royal forest rights. The merchants shared the general desire to evade taxation. Even the King's patriotism was tainted by his wish to retain Gascony.

Disunion in England delayed the attack on Gascony. The Welsh seized what seemed a favourable opportunity for rebellion; and Edward was

obliged to lead an army into Wales. It was not until the summer of 1295 that the Welsh insurrection was suppressed. Meanwhile Philip of France was able not only to defeat the weak force which was sent to Gascony, but to create trouble for Edward in Flanders and Scotland. Count Guy was summoned to Paris, and on his arrival was arrested and detained in prison for some months. He was not released until he gave his daughter, who was betrothed to Edward's son, as a hostage to Philip. Commerce between Flanders and Edward's dominions was forbidden. The closing of the Flemish market led to a revolution in Scotland. King John of Scotland was placed under the control of twelve Scotch magnates; an alliance with France followed; and then, in June 1295, Philip commanded the Flemish to re-open their market to the Scotch. Although the invasion of Gascony proved a failure, the English navy, which Edward organised, was able to check Philip's attempt to gain control of the Channel. Nevertheless in 1295 the revolt of Scotland added greatly to Edward's troubles.

Imitating his uncle de Montfort, Edward, in November 1295, summoned a representative parliament, called the Model Parliament, in order "that what touches all should be approved by all," and that "common dangers should be met by remedies agreed upon in common." Of the common danger the King wrote that Philip "has beset my realm with a great fleet and a great multitude of warriors, and purposes, if his power equal his unrighteous design, to blot out the English tongue from the face of the earth." The laity responded to the appeal; but the clergy declined

to vote an adequate grant. Once more, an insufficient force was sent to Gascony. In Scotland Edward had more success. He was again master of Scotland by force of arms in the summer of 1296.

The tension between Church and King reached its climax at the parliament of Bury in November 1296. The clergy declined to submit to the taxation agreed to by the laity. They pleaded a bull of Boniface VIII., in which, under pain of excommunication, lay rulers were forbidden to tax their clergy and, under the same penalty, the clergy were forbidden to pay such taxes. Edward replied by depriving the clergy of all redress or protection in English law courts. This drastic measure caused many of the clergy to give way; but the quarrel was still smouldering when Edward sailed for Flanders in 1297. In November 1296 Edward made an alliance against France with the Emperor of Germany, the Duke of Austria, the Counts of Holland, Brabant, and Flanders, and other Teutonic princes. The object of the alliance was the deliverance of Flanders from French control.

Philip tried to bribe the Flemish to desert Edward by offering commercial advantages. When this attempt failed a French army moved towards Flanders, and Flemish envoys were sent to beg Edward to come to their Count's assistance. In May 1297 William Wallace became the leader of a Scotch revolt, but neither this nor the disaffection of his barons prevented Edward from sailing to Flanders in August. The magnates flatly refused to go to Gascony and showed no great zeal for the expedition to Flanders. Edward was therefore unable to raise the South of

France against Philip, whilst he tried to drive the French from Flanders. The magnates were apparently conciliated by Edward's promise to redress their grievances on his return; but instead of sending Edward the supply they had promised, they took advantage of his absence by obtaining a confirmation of the Great Charter and the Forest Charter from the boy, Prince Edward, who had been appointed Regent.

Want of money, disunion in Flanders, and the defection of his allies wrecked Edward's scheme. He was reduced to pawning the Crown jewels before he signed a truce with Philip in October 1297, and returned to England in March 1298. One reason for the abandonment of the Flemish campaign was a victory won by Wallace at Stirling Bridge in September 1297. On his return Edward at once made preparations for the conquest of Scotland. In July 1298 the defeat of the Scotch at Falkirk might have led to the union of Scotland and England; but the disaffection of the English lords prevented Edward from making use of his victory. The magnates were dissatisfied because the confirmation of the Forest Charter had not led to the surrender of royal rights. The King was unwilling to abandon his rights unless an arrangement was made by which the royal revenue was not diminished. The dispute ended in the surrender of the royal rights in 1301 in return for a small grant of money. The Statute of Merton, which sanctioned enclosures, the partially successful opposition of the magnates to the Statute of Quo Warranto, which was intended to compel them to disclose their titles to the lands they claimed, and their victory over the King in 1301, were

the first of a long series of measures by which crown lands passed into private hands.

The King obtained the funds he needed for the conquest of Scotland in 1302 by an arrangement made with foreign merchants in a treaty called Carta Mercatoria. Aliens were allowed to trade freely in England with their fellow aliens or with Englishmen. They were exempted from the payment of local dues. They were allowed to sell certain articles retail. In case of dispute they were granted the privilege of being tried by a jury of which half the members should be foreigners. The ancient exactions of the Crown were abolished. In return for these privileges the alien merchants agreed to a scale of export duties fifty per cent. greater than those imposed on wool and leather in the Ancient Customs and to certain moderate duties on other articles imported and exported. There is no record of the amount paid by the foreigners for these privileges; but these New Customs were farmed to the Frescobaldi, Italian financiers, who had obtained a monopoly of English finance after the expulsion of the Jews in 1290.

After the signature of this, the Merchants' Charter, the war with Scotland was vigorously resumed. The magnates were not asked to contribute towards the expenses of the war; but in 1304 the King levied a heavy tallage on the royal domains. This was objected to in the parliament of 1305, but the opposition of the magnates ceased when the King gave them leave to tallage their tenants in like manner. In 1305 the alien priories, for whom no one greatly cared, were forbidden to send money to their foreign parent houses.

This money was paid into the royal exchequer. In the autumn of 1305 Scotland was again subdued and Wallace was hanged at Tyburn. Meanwhile the quarrel between Philip of France and the papacy had been strengthening Edward's position. In 1302 the Sicilian vespers were repeated in the matins of Bruges. Philip invaded Flanders to avenge the massacre of Frenchmen, and suffered a crushing defeat at Courtrai. Although this defeat was partially redeemed at Mons en Puelle in the following year, Philip was obliged to acquiesce in the practical autonomy of Flanders whilst he waged war with the Pope. To free his hands for his great struggle Philip restored Gascony to Edward in 1303, and the Anglo-French peace became an *entente cordiale*. In 1305 a Gascon became Pope Clement V. For seventy years Popes ruled Christendom from Avignon, where they became the servants of the King of France. At first the *entente cordiale* gave Edward almost as much influence over Pope Clement as King Philip possessed.

The relations between England and Scotland had become so embittered that the union could only be maintained by force of arms. In 1306, and again in 1307, the Scotch were in arms under Robert Bruce, who was crowned King of Scotland. In the latter year Edward I. died whilst fighting the Scotch. One of his last instructions was to urge his son, soon to be Edward II., to continue the war until Scotland was subdued. In 1306 Edward had obtained a papal bull absolving him from his oath confirming the Forest Charter. About the same time Edward obtained from the Pope letters suspending Archbishop Winchelsey

and summoning him to the papal Court. In 1305 Edward had received petitions from the poorer folk complaining that they had lost their ancient rights when the forests passed into private hands. He then issued an ordinance reforming the administration of the forests and decreeing that "if any of them that be disafforested by the purlieu would rather be within the forest as they were before, than to be out of the forest, as they be now, it pleaseth the King very well that they shall be received thereunto, so that they may remain in their ancient estate, and shall have common and other easement, as well as they had before." This ordinance might have been framed by de Montfort.

Edward would probably have regained his forest rights after the Pope had absolved him from his oath but for his death in 1307. Weakened by the loss of their leader, Archbishop Winchelsey, the magnates were unable for the moment to resist the King. Edward II., however, inherited an unfinished war with Scotland, a quarrel with English merchants over the Carta Mercatoria, and one with his barons over the revocation of the Forest Charter. There was peace with France until 1323, when a dispute arose over the question of homage for Aquitaine. But in the fighting the English were little involved, and the dispute was settled in 1325 when Edward's eldest son did homage. Nevertheless, the twenty years of Edward's reign were filled with strife. The King failed to recover his forests and the merchants continued to protect their trade, but the victory of the magnates and merchants was won at a great cost. The loss of Scotland and the murder of the King formed part of the price England paid.

## X

### CARTA MERCATORIA AND ITS INFLUENCE

1307–1340

ONE body of foreign merchants in London, the Germans, had little need of the treaty called Carta Mercatoria. They had enjoyed special privileges from the time of Ethelred. These privileges were confirmed by Henry II. and his successors. Their concession in London was the Steelyard. In 1254, when the imperial power decayed after the death of Frederic II., an ancient confederation of Rhine towns, under the headship of Cologne, renewed their union. This confederation ultimately joined a northern federation and became the Hanseatic League, an almost independent State within the Empire of Germany. Lübeck became the centre of the League, and it included the river and coast towns, both German and Dutch, from the Vistula to the Rhine. The Hanse merchants, or Easterlings, as the English called them, missed no opportunity of increasing their privileges, but they were wise enough to remain on friendly terms with the citizens of London. They were responsible for the repair of Bishopsgate and for the payment of one-third of the expense of maintaining its guard. The Easterlings carried to England from the Baltic corn in time of

dearth, and naval stores, such as masts, tar, and hemp. England came to rely upon the Germans for her navy. As late as Elizabeth's reign the *Jesus of Lübeck* was one of England's fighting ships.

Edward II. commenced his reign by reversing his father's policy and disobeying his father's last instructions. The Scotch war was abandoned before the country was completely subdued. Gaveston, a Gascon, who had been banished by Edward I., was recalled, loaded with gifts, and made the King's chief adviser. In one particular Edward II. obeyed his father. He married the French King's daughter Isabella in 1308 at Boulogne. On his return the magnates insisted on the exile of Gaveston. The King's favourite was then sent to Ireland as Regent. Archbishop Winchelsey returned to England, once again to lead the magnates in their contest with the King. Parliament in 1309 gave the King a small grant of money and a long list of grievances, which included Carta Mercatoria.

Carta Mercatoria was disliked not because customs were levied on foreigners, but because in return for these payments to the King foreigners were excused from the payment of local dues, murage, pontage, and pavage, and the cities lost the power of preventing them from competing in the internal trade of England by harassing regulations. After the new customs were suspended at the commencement of Edward's reign the King sanctioned a decree which, among other restrictions, forbade foreign merchants to engage in retail trade or to remain more than forty days at a time in England. One of the first acts of Edward III.

after the abdication of his father was to grant a charter to London which confirmed these privileges. For centuries this drastic method of protection kept the internal trade of England in English hands, thus continuing the work once done by the merchant gilds. External trade was beyond the slender means of the English. They cheerfully recognised the rights of the powerful Hanseatic merchants, and in English commercial legislation the privileges of the Easterlings, which had been granted long before Magna Carta, were always safeguarded. In return the Easterlings did not interfere in the retail trade, nor did they leave the seaports in order to deal directly with the monkish wool growers or the inland wool merchants.

In defiance of the wish of the barons, Gaveston returned to England in July 1309. But when Gaveston's return was followed by the King's promise to redress grievances many of the barons sullenly acquiesced. About this time an attempt was made to increase the King's revenue by letting the waste lands in the royal forests. This promising scheme was dropped when the quarrel between King and magnates developed and the storm broke. The King had farmed the Customs to Italians in order to raise money. With the gates of the island in foreign control, the danger which threatened England can only be compared with that which menaced the country when John acknowledged the suzerainty of the Pope.

In March 1310 there was held a great council of bishops and barons. In spite of the King's order the barons presented themselves in full military array. Edward II. was forced to submit to be controlled by

twenty-one magnates, who were called Ordainers. Forty-one rules by which England was to be governed were drawn up by the Ordainers and submitted to a Parliament. The ordinances decreed that the King should live of his own but should not increase his forests, that the Frescobaldi and other alien merchants to whom the customs had been farmed should be imprisoned until they had accounted for the money they had received, that the Carta Mercatoria should be rescinded and aliens subjected to the ancient oppressive dues and regulations from which they had been freed, also that Gaveston and other friends of the King should be banished from England. In 1311, and again in 1317, Edward II. confirmed the ancient charters to the merchants of the Steelyard, so that, while the Flemish Hanse in England decayed, the Easterlings were able to acquire a practical monopoly of the Anglo-Flemish trade.

There is a marked contrast between the policy of the Ordainers and that for which de Montfort died. Whilst the Kings of France were abolishing serfdom, the magnates of England were annexing forest and waste lands and sowing the seeds of civil war by doing nothing for the agricultural serf or the artisan in the towns. The King's party might have done something for the poor, since, when they had power, only a few months before they were overthrown and the King murdered, a proclamation was issued prohibiting the exportation of fuller's earth, teasles, and other substances used in clothmaking, in order to protect English weavers. The Edwards who have worn the crown of England since the Conquest have often

suffered at the hands of the magnates and middlemen, but of none can it be truly said that they forgot the interests of the poor workers of England.

Gaveston fled to Flanders, but soon returned. With his King he tried to rally the North to the royal cause. This attempt failed; and Gaveston, on the strength of an oath that he should suffer no bodily harm, surrendered to the barons in 1312. Among the many dignities which Edward had bestowed on Gaveston was that of Warden of the forests south of the Trent. No oath could protect so dangerous an enemy of the feudal lords. Soon after his surrender Gaveston was murdered by the barons in sight of their leader Thomas, Earl of Lancaster. This act of treachery divided the baronial party, and after protracted negotiations, during which Archbishop Winchelsey died, peace was made between the King and the barons. Gaveston's murderers were pardoned, and the King tried to obtain the support of his barons in settling the question of Scotland, which had again become acute.

The rich order of the Templars was abandoned by the Pope, who, at Avignon, was in the power of the French King. The dissolution of the order enabled the French and English kings to fill their treasuries with the wealth which the Templars had acquired. The magnates obtained a share of the plunder, but Edward II. obtained enough to enable him to lead an army against the Scotch in 1314. Baronial disloyalty had allowed Robert Bruce to free Scotland from English rule; it also led to the victory of the Scotch at Bannockburn. Edward II. returned to London

discredited by his defeat. After 1314 all power passed into the hands of the barons and their leader, Thomas of Lancaster. The King of Scotland continued to harry the North of England, apparently in collusion with Lancaster, whose estates were spared whilst others were ravaged. Ireland was invaded by the Scotch, and Edward Bruce, the brother of the King of Scotland, assumed the title of King of Ireland. This attempt failed with the death of Edward Bruce in 1318; but it weakened English authority in Ireland. In England the rule of Thomas of Lancaster was accompanied by incessant civil wars, caused by the risings of the poorer folk to re-establish the royal power. The alliance of the prelates and magnates had an injurious effect upon the hierarchy. In the struggle for money and land the spirit of the friars, which had animated Bishop Grossteste, was killed.

"They gave up their whole leisure time to carving bits out of the forest and adding them to their own gardens; sticking up palings round these bits; here a cantle and there a snippet; here a slab and there a slice; a round corner and a square corner; a bare piece of turf or a wooded clump; and all so neighbourly, encouraging each other the while with a 'Brother, will this be to your mind?' or 'Help yourself, neighbour'; and 'Let me recommend, sir, another slice'; or 'A piece of the woody part, dear friend.'" This description of the petty forest thieves of modern times will serve for those of olden days, except that then the amount stolen was proportionate to the greatness of the robbers. They had little mercy for those who opposed their designs

on the common lands, whether in or out of the forest. After Gaveston's death, Hugh Despenser, a son of the justiciar who died with de Montfort at Evesham, was made chief justice of the forests on this side of the Trent. He had been a faithful servant of Edward I. and had obtained the bull which enabled Edward to cancel the forest charter. After the accession of Edward II., Despenser continued to serve the Crown, and he incurred the displeasure of the magnates before Gaveston's murder. He was assisted by his son, also named Hugh, and both the Despensers remained in the service of Edward II. after Bannockburn, although the magnates insisted upon the removal of Despenser from his council. When Thomas of Lancaster failed to establish order in England, the King's party, and in particular the Despensers, obtained more control over the government of England.

When the citizens of London were united they had still great weight in England; but they, too, were weakened by disunion. Just before the death of Henry III. they recovered their privilege of electing a Mayor, and the common folk chose Hervy, a democrat like FitzThomas. The mercantile aldermen were induced to acquiesce somewhat unwillingly. During his year of office Hervy gave the craft gilds, or mediæval trades unions, increased powers. Hervy's successor annulled these grants, so that craftsmen were unable to protect themselves from competition, while the richer merchants retained their privileges. Edward I. weakened the authority of the merchant magnates when he took the city into his hand from 1285 until 1298, and again when he signed the Carta

Mercatoria. In 1319, when the influence of the Despensers over Edward II. was becoming paramount, the King signed ordinances which decreed that no stranger could become free of the city unless he belonged to a craft gild or was elected by the votes of the commonalty of the city. This measure gave London a democratic constitution.

A full Parliament in 1320 attacked the Despensers on the ground of their having encroached on the royal power. The younger Hugh was accused of having taught that allegiance was due to the Crown rather than to the person of the King, and that if the King inclined to do wrong it was the duty of a subject to constrain him to do right: a strange charge to bring against a royal favourite. The Despensers were sentenced to lose their estates and to be exiled. Two months later one of the magnates insulted the Queen, and Edward was spurred into action. He defeated the magnates at Boroughbridge with the aid of Londoners. His great rival, Thomas of Lancaster, fell into Edward's hands and was beheaded. Thus died one who was in all but name a rival King of England; for the conquered magnate was Earl of Leicester, Derby, Salisbury, and Lincoln, as well as of Lancaster. Edward's victory was speedily followed by a commission to inquire into the question of the forests and by the revocation of the Ordinances. The Carta Mercatoria was thus revived. The disaffection of the magnates continued, and London ceased to support the King.

In 1325 the Queen went to France to settle the dispute over Edward's homage for Aquitaine. Next

year she returned to lead an insurrection against her husband. The Londoners joined the party led by the Queen and her paramour, Mortimer. Deserted by all, Edward abdicated in favour of his son, and was then murdered in Berkeley Castle. Before the murder of the King, the Despensers were put to death. Under the guidance of his mother and Mortimer, the boy-King, Edward III., accepted the forest charter and issued charters to the Londoners granting the city its ancient privileges. Foreign merchants were then compelled to conduct their trade in conformity to the ancient rights of the English merchants by a statute passed in 1328. Much of Gascony was lost during the last years of Edward II., and this loss was accepted by a treaty with France after the deposition of Edward II. The independence of Scotland was recognised by another treaty. Though externally England was at peace, she was still distracted by internal discord until Edward III., in 1330, at the age of eighteen, took the government into his own hands. Mortimer was then executed, and the Queen-dowager retired into private life. Taught by experience, the early Parliaments of Edward III. gave their young King adequate grants. In 1333 the Scotch were defeated at Halidon Hill; the English monarch became again master of Scotland, with Edward Baliol as vassal king. Then once more the Flemish market interposed as an obstacle to the union of Great Britain.

After the death of Philip IV. of France in 1314, his three sons, Louis X., Philip V., and Charles IV., reigned in quick succession. These kings left no sons, and, when Charles died in 1328, a nephew of Philip IV.

became Philip VI. of France. The Queen-dowager of England claimed the throne for her son, Edward III., but the claim was not seriously pressed, and Edward paid homage to Philip in 1329. Count Louis of Flanders had found refuge in Paris from his rebellious subjects when Philip VI. became King. Without delay a French army invaded Flanders, and, before Edward did homage, a French victory at Cassel reduced Flanders to subjection to Philip VI. and his vassal, Count Louis. When Scotland was united to England, both Scotch and English wool came from Edward's dominions. The political connexion of France and Flanders was dwarfed by the Anglo-Flemish economic bond. The French wished to annex the English possessions in Gascony, and in 1336 trouble broke out. To please his suzerain, Count Louis expelled Englishmen from Flanders. Edward replied by depriving the French of wool from his dominions. Again Scotland found that the immediate result of union with England was loss of a market for her wool. Before long the Scotch were in revolt.

The Anglo-French war, which began in 1336, resembled that fought by Edward I.; but, whereas the earlier war ended with the failure of the Flemish campaign, this war was fought to the bitter end and won for itself the name of the Hundred Years' War. For more than a century Flanders, France, and England had been preparing for this great struggle. In 1181, and again in 1252, the English were ordered by law to have weapons at hand in case of need. The Flemish and the French had also become nations of potential soldiers. In 1285 Edward I., by the Statute

of Winchester, made every Englishman personally liable for his fitness to defend England. Edward III. reaped the benefit of his grandfather's legislation at Creçy, Poitiers, and Neville's Cross. In the Hundred Years' War commerce was frequently used as a weapon. In 1327 English exports to the Low Countries had to be sent to Bruges; but before they were shipped, they had also to be collected at one of eight English towns called staples. To please the Flemish, Edward III., at the commencement of his reign, allowed them to buy wool in any English town. After the battle of Cassel, Edward issued a proclamation inviting Flemish weavers to settle in England. If it had been possible, in the fourteenth century, to transfer an industry rapidly from one country to another, the Scotch could have found a market for their wool in England, and Great Britain might have been unified. But this transference could only be accomplished by inviting individual weavers to settle in a foreign land and then employing them to teach native apprentices. This slow movement was aided by the Count of Flanders, who banished his weavers if they opposed his pro-French policy. Doubtless the Count could not realise that this emigration of weavers could affect so rich and prosperous a land as Flanders. Yet Belgian writers mark this date as the beginning of the ruin of Flanders.

Edward III. tried to form an alliance with the Germans and the Flemish against the French. He began his reign by confirming the privileges of the Steelyard, and in 1335 gave foreign merchants the same freedom of trade as Englishmen, "notwithstanding

charters, usages, and customs which they (the English) can allege." The Flemish could enjoy these rights if they would separate themselves from the French. On the other hand, Philip VI. offered to forgive debts owed by the Flemish and to give them the monopoly of all wool exported from France if they would remain faithful. The English bribe was the more attractive. The Count of Flanders remained loyal to France; but the Flemish, led by John Van Artevelde, turned towards England. To tempt Count Louis, Edward made him the offer of the hand of one of his daughters, but the offer was refused, and the Count's army was sent to the island of Cadzand, where it could stop communication between England and Flanders.

In November 1337 Louis' army was destroyed by an English force which sailed from Gravesend, and the starving weavers of Ghent hailed with great demonstrations of joy the arrival of supplies of English wool. Almost as soon as the wool, two French ecclesiastics appeared in Ghent and pronounced the dreaded sentences of excommunication and interdict. Artevelde at once appealed to the Pope and entered into communication with the other Flemish cities. The result of Artevelde's action was that at first both England and France agreed to treat Flanders as neutral territory, and the ecclesiastical sentences were repealed. Edward sailed to Antwerp, the seaport of Brabant, where, to his dismay, he found only one-tenth of the twenty thousand sacks of wool which Parliament had promised him. Nevertheless he met his imperial ally at Cologne, and was appointed Vicar-General of the

Empire. The imperial vassals were ready to obey the Vicar-General on one condition only. They expected payment for their services. The English Parliament sent insufficient supplies of wool and money, and Edward was forced to borrow from Flemish merchants and Italian financiers, pledging as security the Crown jewels and the Crown itself.

Meanwhile, the Leliarts, the pro-French party in Flanders, tried to assert the authority of Count Louis and the French. The militia of the cities was then called out, and it became evident that Flanders could not remain neutral. The Pope, irritated by Edward's alliance with a schismatic Emperor, openly espoused the cause of France. An appeal to the Pope could no longer avert interdict if the Flemish rebelled against their lawful suzerain; but Artevelde suggested a way out of this difficulty. Acting on the advice of the leader of the Flemish, Edward revived his claim to the throne of France and therefore to suzerainty over Flanders. He chose as his royal motto: 'Dieu et mon droict.'

The first act of the new suzerain of Flanders was to declare that he would protect Flemish ships, that there should be no restrictions on the sale of Flemish cloth in England, that commercial arrangements made between him and the Flemish cities should hold good against the merchants of England, and that he would continue to be a loyal ally of the Flemish cities whether their Count was friendly or hostile. Then he decreed that the naval forces of England and Flanders should be united, that two-thirds of his army should be recruited in Flanders and Brabant; that, as King of

England, he would bear the whole cost of the army and also pay a large sum to the cities; that for fifteen years Bruges should be the staple for English wool; that the clauses in former treaties with their French suzerains which dealt with excommunication and interdict should be null and void; that the lands which the French had taken from Flanders should be restored; and that there should be a good and common silver and gold coinage in France, Flanders, Brabant, and England.

On paper this scheme was excellent; but funds came with difficulty from England. In the land campaign of 1339 neither Philip nor Edward ventured to take the risk of attacking. To obtain money Edward returned to England in 1340, after having promised the Flemish that he would speedily return with an adequate force. The French fleet was threatening England, and Edward had to collect and equip shipping for England's defence. To obtain money from Parliament the King broke his promise to the Flemish and agreed to a statute which compelled foreigners to submit to the restrictions on the trade of aliens which London and other English towns had the chartered or customary right of imposing. Money was then voted; and, in June 1340, Edward's English fleet destroyed the Frenchmen who had anchored off Sluys, the seaport of Bruges. When the danger of invasion was removed, no more money was collected in England. Hence Edward was unable to follow up his naval victory by a vigorous campaign on land. In September 1340 a truce was signed which gave liberty to the Flemish but failed to restore Gascony

to England. In this truce the King of France renounced his right of excommunicating the Flemish. Overwhelmed with debts Edward III. escaped by stealth from his Flemish creditors and returned to England in November, bent on dealing with those who had wrecked his plans.

# XI

## ENGLAND LOSES SEA POWER

### 1340–1377

ALTHOUGH the interdict of Flanders produced little or no effect in 1340, in another way the pro-French Pope was able to exert a great influence on the campaign. Next to the King the most powerful officials in England were John Stratford, Archbishop of Canterbury, and his brother Robert, Bishop of Chichester. These brothers had been alternately Chancellors of England since Edward began his personal reign. In June 1340 John resigned the great seal to his brother. Just before Edward sailed for Flanders the Archbishop tried to stop the expedition by representing the danger involved in the presence of the French fleet at Sluys. Edward replied that he intended to sail, but that, if the Archbishop was afraid he might remain in England. When in Flanders Edward heard from Sir William de la Pole, Chief Baron of the Exchequer, that the supplies, which Parliament had voted, could not be collected for fear of a revolt. This baron was a wealthy merchant of Hull to whom Edward was greatly indebted and whom he greatly trusted.

On his return Edward imprisoned and fined de la Pole and other lay officials who had neglected to collect

the taxes. He dismissed the two ecclesiastics from their posts of Chancellor and Treasurer of England, replacing them by lay knights. Then he tried to establish once and for all the doctrine of the supremacy of the King by summoning the Archbishop to account to him for the neglect which had ruined the campaign in Flanders. The Archbishop took sanctuary at Canterbury as Becket had done before him. He quoted the Martyr in his sermons and launched general excommunications against breakers of the Great Charter. He further declined to be tried except by his peers in Parliament, and, as these bishops, abbots, and lay lords were the very men who had voted the taxes and then failed to pay, Edward did not accept the Archbishop's challenge. The doctrine that a peer could only be tried by his peers united the baronage, lay and clerical, against the King, and the dispute ended in a compromise.

Stratford escaped trial and the King was forced by Parliament in 1341 to assent to a statute which placed him in a somewhat similar position to that of his father under the Ordainers. On the other hand, the King obtained adequate supply which was duly collected. This year, 1341, was a turning-point in English history. Had the magnates and rich merchants succeeded in destroying the unifying influence of the royal power before the weavers had become an influential body and while agricultural workers were still serfs, that disunion, which destroyed Germany, Italy, and Flanders, might have also claimed Great Britain as its victim. With rare courage, within a few months of the royal assent being given Edward formally revoked the

statute, boldly asserting that his assent was not real, "but as then it behoved us, we dissimuled in the premisses." The King's courage was rewarded when his next Parliament ratified the revocation.

Though Stratford had posed as a second St. Thomas of Canterbury, the incident proves clearly that an immense change had taken place since the reign of Henry II. Becket took his stand on his privilege as an ecclesiastic and boldly denied the right of any English layman to sit in judgment on him. In Becket's time the Archbishop could claim that he was the head of a body whose power was co-ordinate with that of the English nation. But Stratford shielded himself behind his privilege as a peer of England and appealed alike to lay and clerical peers to assert the privilege which they enjoyed in common. The utmost that Stratford dared demand was a trial by his lay and spiritual peers in Parliament, which Becket would have scornfully refused. This change is strikingly illustrated by the subsequent ecclesiastical legislation of Edward's reign. These statutes in theory anticipated the emancipation of the English Church from the control of Rome; but theory and practice in the Middle Ages often differed widely, and these statutes were not obeyed. The land hunger of the magnates was appeased for a time by the plunder of the forests. In the reign of Edward II. the alien priories were first attacked. The magnates obtained a large part of the estates of the alien monks as these were gradually confiscated. Although the confiscation of all monastic lands was deferred until the sixteenth century, this larger scheme was in the air;

hence any union between the lay and clerical magnates could only be short-lived.

After the truce of Esplechin, Count Louis seemed to be willing to govern Flanders in accord with Artevelde, who maintained close and cordial relations with England. It soon, however, became evident that the Count was using his position to further the aims of the French King. In 1342 civil war in Brittany diverted Philip's attention from Flanders, which was at this time weakened by civil strife. In July 1345 the outlook in Flanders seemed brighter; at least, so Edward was assured by Artevelde when they met at Sluys. Froissart asserts that at this conference it was arranged that the Prince of Wales should replace Count Louis as ruler of Flanders; but modern historians regard this as somewhat doubtful. At any rate, Anglo-Flemish relations were intimate and cordial.

After their meeting at Sluys Edward returned to England, and Van Artevelde to Ghent, where he was murdered. The Flemish cities hastened to express their horror at a crime which had deprived Edward of a friend and an ally. They also assured Edward that he could still count upon their support. In July 1346 Edward sailed to Normandy and simultaneously the Flemish marched south. Edward's small army reached the outskirts of Paris, but the Flemish were unable to join him. Forced to retreat Edward won a brilliant victory at Creçy and then besieged Calais, at that time a town on the frontier of Flanders. Calais surrendered to the English in August 1347.

Count Louis was killed fighting for the French at Creçy. His son, Louis de Male, entered at once into negotiations with his Flemish subjects. In 1347 Edward left his army, which was besieging Calais, met the Count in Flanders, and arranged that the young ruler should marry his daughter Isabella. A fortnight before the date arranged for the wedding, Count Louis fled from Flanders to the court of his French suzerain. In May, Flanders was placed under interdict, and Philip offered to secure the removal of the interdict and to grant extraordinary commercial advantages to the Flemish if they would abandon their English alliance. But the Flemish remained faithful to their English allies. Before the fall of Calais Philip was approaching with a large army to relieve the town, when the advent of a Flemish army forced him to retire in great haste, and Calais became the most prized possession of England. Not only was Calais an open door through which English armies could enter France, but it became the staple at which the Flemish could buy English wool, until England had developed manufactures so that she ceased to sell raw materials.

After the capture of Calais a general truce was signed. For eight years, until 1355, England and France were nominally at peace ; in reality these years were full of fighting in France and on the narrow seas. Immediately after the truce was signed the Black Death spread throughout France, and in August 1348 the disease appeared in England. The cessation of war on a grand scale is probably due to the desolation caused by this plague rather than to the formal truce.

In the interval between the signature of the truce and the appearance of the Black Death Flanders was treacherously attacked by the French. The Flemish appealed to Edward for aid, and were told that English help would be given if they would pay for the expedition. Though England was very prosperous Edward could not rely upon parliamentary grants; and an English army in Flanders could not live by pillage as it did in France. Before sailing for Normandy Edward had been compelled to repudiate his debts to the Florentine bankers. Florentine distress and the plunder of France paid for the campaign which gave Calais to England. To defend Flanders cost much, to attack France brought wealth to England; hence the later wars of Edward's reign consisted chiefly of marauding expeditions to France.

The invasion of Flanders was stopped by the Black Death; but a war of intrigue continued until the power of the Flemish cities was fatally weakened at the battle of Rosebeque in 1382. While the Flemish accumulated wealth, their vicious economic system gave them neither rest in the present nor security for the future. Their wealth came from weaving. Their looms were fed with English wool; and when the English made cloth, the Flemish were forced to rely almost entirely upon the French market for the sale of their finished product. They were also largely dependent on France for their food. This economic division was reflected in Flemish politics. The Leliarts advocated union with France and submission to the counts, while the Blauwaerts favoured a close alliance with England, burgher rule, and a merely nominal

connexion with count or French suzerain. The absence of a strong unifying force, such as England possessed in her kings, led to strife between towns and between gilds in the same town. It was a simple matter for the French to play one faction against the other and to profit by the internal disunion.

A canal connected Ghent with the sea, but the merchants of Bruges induced Louis' father to make Bruges the staple for English wool so that they could make their profit on it before the weavers of Ghent were supplied. Flanders was fed with grain from Artois; in 1379 the merchants of Bruges obtained from Count Louis permission to unite two rivers by a canal so that the staple for grain might be at Bruges instead of Ghent. Hence the rich burghers of Bruges, who were international traders, were also Leliarts; and the burghers of Ghent, who depended mainly on the weaving industry, were Blauwaerts. But both factions were in favour of a close commercial connexion with England.

The same selfishness was shown in the relation of gilds to each other. Artevelde's death followed a fierce fight between the weavers and the fullers of Ghent. At times the counts opposed any increase of French authority and promoted cordial relations with England. Count Louis de Male all but married into the English royal family, and his daughter and heiress was betrothed to one of Edward's sons before her marriage in 1369 to Philip, Duke of Burgundy and brother of King Charles V. of France. Until 1360 France was weakened and impoverished by English raids. She was engaged in expelling the invaders

during the next fifteen years. As soon as she felt equal to the task she attacked the Flemish cities. The battle of Rosebeque in 1382 placed Flanders at the mercy of her Count and his Burgundian son-in-law. But Ghent maintained a certain amount of independence; and the Dukes of Burgundy soon became rivals of the Kings of France. Thus the Flemish market remained open to English wool as long as England allowed it to be exported.

In 1346 the Scotch invaded England during Edward's absence in France. At Neville's Cross King David II. of Scotland was defeated and sent a prisoner to the Tower of London. In 1357 David was released on promise of a large ransom which was never fully paid. Scotland was kept poor by internal strife, whilst England grew in strength from the immigration of the Flemish and the development of weaving. For years there were fights on the borderland between England and Scotland, but nothing worthy to be called war. England, however, now began to face a new rival, one with whom she was destined at a later date to wage war for centuries.

The production of wool was being rapidly developed in Spain, hence she was competing with England in the Flemish market, as well as with Gascony in the wine trade. Her ships, built to face the stormy Bay of Biscay, were far larger than the English. The disappearance of the naval power of France and the hold England obtained over the Straits of Dover by the capture of Calais gave England such supremacy in the narrow seas as to endanger Spanish trade. Philip VI. of France died in 1350 and was succeeded

by his son John II., who at once allied himself with Peter the Cruel of Castile. A Spanish fleet sailed to Sluys, capturing twenty Anglo-Gascon ships on the way. A defeat of this miniature Armada was enacted when the fleet left Flanders to pillage the coasts of England. Edward III. and his eldest son, the Black Prince, waited for the towering Spaniards off Winchelsea. In spite of the difference in size the English were victorious. Fourteen Spanish ships were captured and the rest driven off in disorder. Edward boarded and captured one of the largest Spaniards, while his own ship was so badly injured that it was left to founder.

In 1355 the Black Prince raided Southern France. Edward III. had intended at the same time to raid Northern France, but he was recalled by a movement of the Scotch, and spent the first few months of 1356 in devastating part of Scotland. In 1356 an English raid reduced Normandy to a state of anarchy, whilst the Black Prince moved towards the north and defeated the French at Poitiers. King John was captured and taken to London. A truce was then signed and negotiations followed which led to the treaty of Bretigny in 1360. By this treaty an enormous ransom was promised for King John ; Aquitaine was given to England, together with territory in the neighbourhood of Calais. The King of Castile, Peter the Cruel, made haste to come to terms with Edward. In 1362 a treaty between England and Castile was signed in London.

Peter's bastard half-brother, Henry, entered Castile in 1366 with an army of English and French soldiers,

who, after the treaty of Bretigny, had been supporting themselves by pillage on their own account. In 1364 King John died, and his son, Charles V., encouraged this expedition and lent it his general, Du Guesclin. In this way Charles freed France from the scourge of bandits and at the same time tried to gain control over the navy of Spain. Peter of Castile fled to Bordeaux, where he sought help from the Black Prince, who had been made Prince of Aquitaine. An army led by the Black Prince won a brilliant victory at Navarete, and placed Peter once more on the throne of Castile. Then the double-dealing of the Castilian King wrecked his own cause and England's power in Aquitaine. Peter had promised to meet the expenses of the army of occupation. This promise was not kept, and the Black Prince led back to Aquitaine his army wasted by famine and disease. Two years later Peter was killed by his half-brother Henry, and Castile became the ally of France.

These facts help to explain the economic policy of the latter half of Edward's reign. In 1351 alien merchants were allowed to trade freely in England in defiance of the charters and privileges of the English merchant gilds. Two years later English merchants were not allowed to export wool, and Gascons were allowed to sell wines freely in England, whilst Englishmen might only buy wines in Bordeaux and Bayonne. Aliens were ready to pay for royal protection whilst English merchants persisted in trying to avoid taxation. Money was needed by the King, hence there was a strong motive for diverting trade into alien hands. The advantages given to aliens also tended

to bind the Flemish and the Gascons to the King of England.

But however fascinating this policy may have seemed, it had one grave defect. It was fatal to the growth of an English mercantile marine, and at that date merchant ships were largely used in the navy when war broke out. Disaster has always followed when England has neglected her navy. The failure of Peter the Cruel to pay the money he had promised forced the Black Prince to levy a hearth tax in Aquitaine. The towns, by reason of their liberties, were exempt from this tax, and the country districts naturally rebelled when called upon to pay for a war waged in order that Gascon and English merchants might not fear an attack by the Spanish. In 1372 an English fleet bearing reinforcements to Aquitaine was destroyed by the navy of King Henry of Spain. England then lost command of the sea, and her oversea empire was doomed. In 1374 the English possessions in Southern France were reduced to little more than the cities of Bordeaux and Bayonne. These cities and Calais were almost all that remained of England's dominions in France when Edward III. died in 1377.

Although the outflow of money to Rome was checked by the anti-papal legislation of Edward III., and tribute to Rome was not paid after 1366, these years foreshadowed a sorry future for England. The scarcity of labour, after the Black Death, raised wages and the price of necessaries of life, in spite of the Statutes of Labourers, which were intended to keep wages and prices at their old level. Whilst the Kings of France were emancipating their serfs, English

Parliaments were doing less than nothing for the poor of England, since forest charters and Statutes of Labourers took from manual workers the little that they had. If contemporary writers are believed, the friars had so far forgotten their early ideals that they took by guile from the weak, whilst others took by force. In the teaching of John Wycliffe and his followers, the Lollards, there was much of the former doctrine of the friars; and Lollardism spread rapidly in England.

To harmonise the feudal system with the national idea which was replacing feudalism in England and France, Edward III. of England and John II. of France, by marriage and royal grants, arranged that the great fiefs should become the property of their children. The Black Prince died before Edward III., leaving a son who, at the age of eleven, became Richard II. in 1377. Three years later Charles VI., also at the age of eleven, became King of France. Both kings were surrounded by uncles possessing almost independent power. In England, John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, and his brother, the Duke of Gloucester, led the barons. In France the most powerful of the King's uncles was the Duke of Burgundy. From painful experience both nations had to learn that disunion and decentralisation were followed by civil war and misery.

The disunion in England, which ultimately led to the War of the Roses, was partly concealed whilst the English were engaged in plundering France. The magnates were at times united in opposition to the King, but they had no other bond of union. After

the Black Death laymen used their lands for sheep-farming, and thus became the competitors of the wool-growing monks. When Wycliffe preached apostolic poverty he had eager listeners in the feudal lords who coveted the lands of their rival wool-growers. Lay and clerical magnates were, however, at one in wishing to come into direct touch with the foreigner and dispense with the services of English merchants. By thus eliminating a body of English workers they hoped to buy cheap and sell dear.

In the Church there was a conservative party, which was ready to acquiesce in the Roman connexion in order to retain its temporal possessions, and Lollard reformers, who were ready to abandon wealth and make the Church entirely national. Every merchant was anxious to protect his own trade but was reluctant to extend the advantage of protection to his neighbour. Thus when the London fishmongers tried to protect the English fishing industry, other citizens were anxious to buy direct from foreign fishermen. The development of the English fishing industry was retarded by the opposition of those who wished to buy fish cheap.

Before the death of Edward III. the contest between the sections into which the English were divided began. His grandson Richard succeeded to the rule of an already distracted country. The sections were, roughly speaking, grouped in a baronial and a mercantile party. Lancaster led the baronial party. He had married the legitimate Queen of Castile, and hoped that the reconquest of Aquitaine might help him to expel the bastard Henry from

Spain. The mercantile party, on the other hand, was content with command of the Straits of Dover, and disliked the idea of fighting for Aquitaine. Both parties were, however, fully alive to the necessity of restoring England's naval power. The nobles derisively called Richard the Londoners' King; and the boy-king probably owed his undisputed succession to the merchants of London.

## XII

### STRIFE BETWEEN KING AND BARONS

1377–1413

DURING the later years of Edward's reign the illness of the King and his eldest son threw the government into Lancaster's hands. The statutes which gave foreigners complete freedom of trade in England and forbade the export of wool by English merchants caused much discontent. By favouring Wycliffe, Lancaster tried to find a vent for this discontent in an attack on the Church; but a year before Edward's death the Good Parliament gave expression to English feeling. Certain officials, acting for Lancaster, had abused their right of selling royal licences to enable English merchants to export wool contrary to the statutes. These men were impeached, dismissed from office, and fined. A long list of grievances was drawn up and a standing council was appointed to advise the King. A charter was issued to London restoring protection of inland trade to English merchants. Lancaster was unable to offer effective resistance; but in the following year he assembled a Parliament packed with his own adherents and thus undid much of the work of the Good Parliament. This Parliament levied a poll-tax

graduated according to the wealth of the taxpayers. The minimum tax was fourpence.

The result of the mercantile policy of Edward III. was the abandonment by English merchants of their claim to pay no more than the Ancient Custom on the export of wool. The violent measure of 1333, which gave aliens a monopoly of England's foreign trade and made the export of English wool by native merchants a crime, was evaded by royal licences; but English merchants found that it was better to pay heavier duties than to buy licences. When the English merchants agreed to pay subsidies in excess of the Ancient Custom, they were again allowed to export wool and leather. The subsidies varied, but on an average they increased the Ancient Custom ten to twentyfold for natives and the Hanse merchants of the Steelyard, while other aliens were more heavily taxed. A substantial protection was thus given to English weaving, since the looms of Flanders had come to depend on English wool for the making of fine cloth. Spanish and Scotch wool could only be used when mixed with the wool of England. In dressing, dyeing, and finishing cloth England lagged behind Flanders; but early in the fifteenth century unfinished English cloth could be placed on the Flemish market at a price which meant ruin to Flemish weavers. In 1434 the Flemish admitted defeat by prohibiting the importation of English cloth.

When English merchants were debarred from foreign trade English shipping declined, and as the navy in those days depended on merchant ships, England lost command of the sea. In the French

war which began again in 1369 England was forced to defend herself instead of attacking France. In 1372 command of the sea passed to the allied navies of Castile and France, and money had to be raised for the defence of the English coast. When the Isle of Wight had to be ransomed from the French, and Hastings was burned, England's danger forced Richard's early Parliaments to undertake the creation of a navy. In Richard's first Parliament, held at Westminster in 1377, the baronial and mercantile parties appear to have made a temporary truce while measures were taken for the defence of England. Money was voted for the navy, and two merchants were appointed treasurers of the grants. On the other hand, Lancaster was given command of the fleet; but the internal peace of England had but a short life.

While Edward III. was dying, Wycliffe was summoned to St. Paul's to answer a charge of heresy. Lancaster intervened on behalf of Wycliffe, and offered violence to the Bishop of London. Although Lollardism was very prevalent in London, the citizens could not miss an opportunity of showing their hatred to Lancaster, who was only saved from a riotous mob by the intervention of the bishop. The dying King succeeded in making peace; but after Richard's first Parliament a reason for a new quarrel was found. Lancaster's fleet failed to accomplish all that was expected of it, while a private fleet, equipped at the cost of Philipot, one of the treasurers, captured fifteen French and Spanish ships. In 1378 Parliament sat at Gloucester that it might be free from London's influence. Philipot was accused of using public money for his

fleet ; but he had little difficulty in proving that it had been paid for out of his own resources. The restrictions on foreign merchants were then partially removed by statute, although the preamble describes the dislike felt by English merchants to foreign competition.

A contemporary monk, Thomas of Walsingham, who was in favour of foreign competition, has left a record of one result of this statute. At that time, he wrote, all Eastern goods carried by the Genoese were brought to England and sold to English merchants who resold them to the Flemish, Normans, and Bretons. A rich Genoese merchant tried to take advantage of the statute. He promised many gifts to the King if Richard would allow him to settle at Southampton, where a castle had recently been built. He pledged himself to make Southampton the finest port in the West, and would probably have succeeded in annexing the profits hitherto made by English merchants had he not been murdered before the door of the house in London at which he was lodging. John Kyrkeby, the instigator of the murder, for a time escaped punishment ; and the chronicler expressed his fear that other foreign merchants would be deterred from imitating the Genoese.

In 1380 Parliament met at Northampton that Kyrkeby might be tried away from London. He was tried by Parliament, probably because it was thought that no jury would convict. Kyrkeby was hanged, and Parliament turned its attention to raising money. The parliament of Gloucester had voted a poll-tax, whose minimum was fourpence a head. This tax had proved insufficient. The Parliament of Northampton

voted a new poll-tax, whose minimum was a shilling a head. The anger of the poor at once found voice. Parliaments had sanctioned enclosures of common lands. The peasants had watched their nobles force the King to surrender his forest rights. They knew that their kinsfolk in the towns had not altogether unsuccessfully contended with merchant princes, who were strong enough to oppose the will of the magnates in Parliament. They had doubtless heard that in France and Flanders serfs had acquired rights which were denied to English agricultural labourers. Recently French and Flemish peasants had resisted excessive taxation by taking arms. They had little to expect from submission when Statutes of Labourers limited wages in the interests of the rich.

Lollards had been preaching Christian Socialism and had found eager listeners among the oppressed. Ignorant of the modern economic paradox that direct taxation is less oppressive than indirect, the labourers of England saw in the poll-tax a means by which the burden of defending England would be shifted to their shoulders from those of the magnates. The insurrection which followed would probably be repeated if the modern income-tax were extended to those who earn a weekly wage. With no clearly defined object, except the abolition of the poll-tax and the redress of grievances which varied according to the locality, the people took arms, and a large body of insurgents were welcomed by the workers of London. Lancaster's palace was destroyed; the Archbishop of Canterbury was murdered; and, among other victims, merchants or bankers who pronounced bread and cheese with a

Flemish accent were put to death. This was London's answer to the statute passed at Gloucester and the execution of Kyrkeby.

The poll-tax was not levied after the insurrection; but little else was gained by the poor. To pacify the insurgents the King promised to abolish serfdom, but Parliament insisted upon the King's breaking his promise to the English poor. Serfdom, however, gradually disappeared during the next century. When the revolt of the peasants was suppressed England's attention was diverted to foreign affairs. The Duke of Burgundy had married the heiress of Flanders before the accession of his nephew, Charles VI., to the throne of France. Burgundy induced the young King to attack the Flemish cities which had become practically independent of either count or suzerain. In 1382 Flanders was again made subject to France after the battle of Rosebeque. After Creçy and Poitiers the popes were able to return from Avignon to Rome. In 1377 the French tried to regain their former control over the papacy by recognising an anti-pope Clement VII. at Avignon in opposition to Urban VI. The French and the Leliarts in Flanders became Clementines, while the English and the Blauwaerts accepted Pope Urban. After Rosebeque, England, owing to the strife of factions, was unable to help the Blauwaerts with a regular army; but Parliament gave a grant of money to the Bishop of Norwich, who led an Urbanist crusade to Flanders. This crusade did less than was expected; but it kept alive the resistance of Ghent and contributed largely to ruin an invasion of England which the French had planned. Parliament in 1381 passed the

first English Navigation Act, which compelled English merchants, who had recovered the right of exporting goods, to use English shipping in order that there might be an adequate reserve of merchant-ships in case of need. There was therefore an English fleet prepared to defend England from invasion; but the policy of the Navigation Act was abandoned when the magnates obtained power, and, before the end of Richard's reign, England's naval power had again become very weak.

Whilst the Flemish were sullenly acquiescing in French rule, England's friends, the Portuguese, routed the Castilians. To follow up this success Parliament, in 1385, voted money for an army which Lancaster led to Portugal in the following year. In this Parliament the King refused his assent to a proposed measure confiscating the temporalities of the Church. The attack on the Church, however, was not renewed until merchants and magnates had finished their quarrel. Lancaster took advantage of the disunion in the city between those who wished to buy fish caught by foreigners and those who wished to protect London fishermen. Northampton led those who wished to buy fish from foreigners, and Brembre those who wished to keep the London fish market for Londoners. After the Peasants' Revolt Northampton became mayor. Two years later Brembre was elected. This election was followed by a riot in which Northampton was implicated, and he was sentenced to be hanged. Owing to Lancaster's influence, this sentence was commuted into imprisonment, from which he was released in 1387.

Richard's uncle, the Duke of Gloucester, took Lancaster's place when the latter sailed for Portugal, while Lancaster's son, Henry of Derby, also led the barons. The King made large grants to his uncles, and a cry arose that, if the King would abstain from giving and live of his own, taxation would be lighter. These and other royal grants were bribes paid by the King to secure the loyalty of the magnates. Discontent was increased when Richard's friend, the Earl of Oxford, was made Marquis of Dublin and received the promise of a grant from England in case the Irish revenue proved insufficient. Little had been done in Ireland since the reign of Henry II. Left to themselves, the settlers in Ireland amalgamated with the Irish. The De Burghs became Burkes; and Ormonds, Geraldines, and Desmonds were regarded by the Irish as national leaders. In 1387 Irish industry had so far developed that safe conducts were issued by the Flemish to Irish merchants; and, in 1399, Sluys was made the staple for the sale of Irish cloaks. Richard's chief adviser was the Earl of Suffolk, eldest son of de la Pole, the merchant who played so conspicuous a part in the reign of Edward III. Oxford's mission to Ireland was the prelude to the union of the two islands which Richard would probably have permanently established had the English magnates allowed him to reign in peace.

The mercantile party failed to conclude a satisfactory peace with France; and an unsuccessful campaign against the Scotch, who were in alliance with France, gave the magnates their opportunity. When Parliament met in 1786 Suffolk asked for large grants for

England's defence. The magnates refused their aid unless Suffolk was dismissed. When Richard refused, the records of the deposition of Edward II. were read to both houses, and, under this menace, the King yielded. Suffolk was impeached and imprisoned. Oxford was ordered to betake himself to Ireland, and Richard was placed under the control of Gloucester and ten other magnates. The King took the opinion of the judges of England, who found that the barons had acted unconstitutionally, and King and barons prepared for civil war. In March 1387 the English fleet engaged the French, who were escorting a wine-fleet to Sluys. The French suffered a crushing defeat. One hundred and twenty-six ships were captured by the English, and all danger of invasion passed away. The glamour of this victory and internal disunion made London hesitate in declaring against the barons. Richard again yielded.

In February 1388 the Merciless Parliament met. Five Lords Appellant, led by Gloucester and Derby, impeached Suffolk, Oxford, the Chief Justice, the Archbishop of York, and Brembre. The Archbishop was deprived of his see and his property; the others were sentenced to be drawn and hanged. This punishment was inflicted on the Chief Justice and Brembre; but Suffolk and Oxford made their escape from England and died in Ireland. Among other victims, the judges who had given their opinion to the King were sentenced to death; but this sentence was commuted to perpetual exile in Ireland. Having disposed of their opponents, the magnates re-enacted two statutes of Edward III. which gave foreign merchants complete

free trade in England; they also voted themselves a large sum of money for their services.

When in power the magnates adopted the peace policy of the men they had murdered; and in 1389 a truce for three years with France was signed. Lancaster's war with Castile had not been crowned with success; but in 1388 he married his daughter to the Castilian King and received a large sum for relinquishing his claim to the Crown. Before the truce was signed with France Richard declared that he was of age and intended to rule without the aid of his uncle Gloucester. The return of Lancaster to England a few months later enabled Richard to effect this revolution without bloodshed. He then, with great tact, gradually undid the work of the Lords Appellant.

In 1391 a statute was passed restoring inland trade to the English. The preamble of this statute states of those granting free trade "that the statutes, if they be fully holden and executed, shall extend to the great hindrance and damage as well of the city of London as of other cities, boroughs, and towns of this realm." London, however, showed little gratitude for a gift which was marred in the eyes of the faction in power because it gave the same protection to those who sold fish and victuals as to those who dealt in wool and manufactured goods. The King tried to raise money on a valuable jewel; and the citizens not only refused to lend but attacked and left for dead a Lombard who was ready to help the King. Richard then took the city into his hand, but not for long. In August 1392 there was a formal reconciliation of the King and his city during a royal visit. Richard then entreated

his Londoners to set an example to other towns by respecting law and order. At the King's request a neutral mayor, Richard Whittington, was appointed, who held office until 1398.

Richard tried to make peace in the Church by preventing the Lollards from attacking the bishops and the bishops from violently persecuting their opponents. In 1395 the King received the submission of the Irish chieftains in Ireland. While he established his authority in the island he endeavoured to reform its government, so that union might be a blessing to both England and Ireland. Next year the King married the seven-year-old daughter of Charles VI. of France, arranging at the same time a peace for thirty years. After eight years of wise and just rule, Parliament expressed its thanks by formulating a list of grievances which contained a complaint of the number and expense of the King's household. The ladies who formed the retinue of the child-queen were specially mentioned. This remonstrance was sent by magnates who held courts of their own and had large bodies of armed retainers in readiness to attack the King.

It must have seemed as if the days of the Merciless Parliament were going to be revived, and Richard determined to strike first. Gloucester, Warwick, and Arundel were arrested and accused before Parliament in 1397. Gloucester died in prison before his trial. Arundel was executed. Warwick threw himself on the King's mercy and was banished. The estates of the convicted magnates were divided among the eight nobles who managed the *coup d'état*. One of these was Henry of Derby, a former Lord Appellant;

he became Duke of Hereford. In January 1398 Parliament made large grants to the King for the rest of his life, and then dissolved after giving a small committee power to act for the whole body. During this Parliament Hereford accused the Duke of Norfolk, a baron who had been rewarded for loyalty to the King, of treasonable conversation. By what appears to be a curiously inconsistent sentence, Norfolk was banished for life and Hereford for six years. Since Lancaster, Hereford's father, acquiesced and remained on friendly terms with Richard, it is probable that the sentence would seem more reasonable if all the facts were known.

For a short while Richard enjoyed autocratic power, supported by a large body of mercenary soldiers from Wales. To pay the soldiers and bribe the friendly magnates Richard spent money lavishly. In 1398 Lancaster died. The King seized the Lancastrian estates and altered Hereford's sentence into banishment for life. This bold act alarmed all holders of property; but the King underestimated the danger which threatened his despotism. Roger, Earl of March and heir apparent to the throne, had been made ruler of Ireland. March was killed during a revolt of the Irish in August 1398. His two infant sons alone stood between the disinherited Duke of Lancaster and succession to the Crown. Richard led an expedition to Ireland to re-establish English rule, and Lancaster landed in Yorkshire. The King's followers abandoned his cause. On his return from Ireland in 1399, Richard, with hardly a struggle, surrendered himself to his victorious cousin. The

conquered king was deposed, and died soon after his deposition in Pontefract Castle. It is more than probable that he was murdered. Lancaster was elected by Parliament and crowned King Henry IV.

To the victors the spoils. The legislation of Henry IV. explains his success. In 1401 ecclesiastics obtained a statute enabling them to burn heretical Lollards who denounced the wealth of the Church. Lancastrian barons were rewarded at the expense of Richard's friends. The wool merchants obtained their heart's desire when, in the first year of Henry's reign, the fish trade was thrown open to foreign competition in spite of the fishmongers' charters. Four years later the Londoners appear to have agreed on a compromise. Then another statute was passed decreeing "that all the merchant strangers of what estate or condition that they be, coming, dwelling, or repairing within the realm of England, shall be entreated or demeaned in the manner, form, and condition as the merchant denizens be, or shall be entreated or demeaned in the parts beyond the sea," and that merchant strangers should suffer loss of goods and imprisonment if they accepted greater privileges than their fellow-countrymen accorded to English merchants. Foreigners had to lodge with an English host, who was responsible for their not remaining more than a limited time in England and for their buying English goods with the money they received for the goods they sold in England. In this way it was ordained by law that imports should be paid for by real exports.

In 1406 the neutral mayor Whittington was again

elected, and London showed little concern when Henry raised loans, Lollards were burned, and friars were hanged. Anglo-Flemish trade suffered little when, in 1403, France and England resumed their war, if the ineffective fighting of this period deserves the name of war. Neither England nor France was able to fight. France was divided into parties, one led by Duke John of Burgundy and the other by Louis, Duke of Orleans and brother of the mad King Charles VI. The Anglo-French war was resumed by the Orleanists. When Duke John wished to join, he was stopped by the Flemish towns on whose wealth he depended. During the struggle between the Burgundians and Orleanists, the Duke of Orleans was murdered in 1407. The young Duke of Orleans and his father-in-law, the Count of Armagnac, continued the contest with the Burgundians. During this civil war the Flemish regained their ancient semi-independence and traded with the English as if there had been an Anglo-French peace.

At home Henry IV. had many troubles. Wars with the Scotch and the Welsh and English insurrections filled the first ten years of his reign, which lasted only fourteen years. These wars exhausted the royal treasury and made Henry almost as dependent on Parliament as he had made his cousin Richard on the Lords Appellant in 1387. The post of King of England was one which exhausted the wealth of the richest, and the revenue of the Lancastrian estates was insufficient to enable the King to balance expenditure and income. Two of his predecessors had been deposed and murdered.

Edward III. might have shared their fate had he not satisfied the greed of England with the plunder of France. Before Henry IV. died his crown was by no means secure. Henry V., who became King on the death of his father in 1413, appears to have laid this lesson to heart, since it was not long before he followed in the footsteps of his great-grandfather Edward III.

## XIII

### CAUSES WHICH LED TO THE WAR OF THE ROSES

1411–1450

DURING the contest in which magnates wrested the royal forest rights from their King, Edward II. lost his throne and life. Richard II. shared his ancestor's fate when merchants and magnates quarrelled over the protection of England's inland trade. A compromise was effected when the first Lancastrian kings ruled England. Edward III. impressed on English merchants the wisdom of acquiescing in export duties when he forbade them to engage in foreign trade. After this heavy export duties were paid by the English and the Hanse of the Steelyard, while still larger duties were paid by other aliens. Under Henry IV. the English paid the equivalent of twenty pence of modern money, and ordinary aliens the equivalent of twenty-four pence on each pound of exported wool. Under Henry V. the English paid about seventeen pence, while aliens still paid at their former rate. The question of restrictions on foreign merchants was temporarily settled by a statute which gave foreigners rights similar to those which they granted to Englishmen trading abroad.

Henry V., however, sat on an uncertain throne.

Amidst their internal convulsions the French respected the persons of their kings, whilst the English first humbled and then murdered theirs. It is not surprising that Henry V. spent his life trying to succeed to the throne of France after the mad King Charles VI., whose life was held sacred by Burgundian and Orleanist. In 1411 Henry IV. had sent an English expedition to France, only to abandon his Burgundian allies, when, in 1412, the Orleanists bribed the English King with a promise of Aquitaine. England's double dealing for a time ruined Duke John of Burgundy. His influence in Paris waned; and the States of Flanders negotiated with England as though they had no ruler. The Duke was forced to accept a treaty signed at Senlis between the States of Flanders and an invading Orleanist army. This treaty stipulated that the Duke should hand Flanders over to his son and retire to Burgundy. Although the rapidly growing weaving industry of England and the Florentine market made the Flemish wool market of less importance, yet English merchants must have felt concern when the Orleanists controlled Bruges, the port to which rough English cloth was going in increasing quantity to be finished by the expert dyers and dressers of Flanders. Without difficulty Henry V. obtained a grant from Parliament in 1414 for an expedition to France.

In spite of the treaty of Senlis, Duke John allied himself with the English; but the Flemish nobles joined the French army. In August 1415 the English landed at the mouth of the Seine and captured Harfleur, which was re-peopled with English settlers as

Calais had been. Henry was then able to block the waterway along which the products of Rouen and Paris found access to the sea, but his army was too small for more ambitious schemes of conquest. Instead of re-embarking for England he marched by land to Calais, probably in order to ascertain whether the conquest of the Norman coast between Harfleur and Calais would be a difficult operation. At Agincourt the English were opposed by a French army of about four times the English strength. Once again, not far from Creçy, the English won a brilliant victory. The Duke of Orleans was captured at Agincourt, and the Count of Armagnac became the leader of the Orleanists. In November Henry was warmly welcomed by his Londoners, who dreamed that the plunder of France would again cross the Channel as in the days of Edward III. Parliament cheerfully voted funds for an expedition with which the king sailed to Normandy in 1417. But Henry soon made it evident that he intended to win a kingdom and not to pillage France.

English greed and disunion were appropriately rewarded by the campaign of Henry V. From the first Henry made it clear that little plunder would be sent to England. Stringent rules protected the property and lives of non-combatant Frenchmen; and town after town in Normandy submitted to the English King. But once embarked on this enterprise the English could not turn back. Had they done so, the Burgundians would have been crushed, and control of the Channel which was necessary for England's export trade would have passed to France.

For the policy which gave France access to the Mediterranean through Toulouse was bearing fruit. The time was at hand when men described a man of colossal wealth by saying "He is as rich as Jacques Cœur," the merchant prince who financed the Armagnac and whose Mediterranean fleets rivalled those of Genoa and Venice. The Emperor Sigismund visited England in 1416; and his advice that the King should guard Dover and Calais as his two eyes was an oft-told tale in England. French ships could have been moved from the Mediterranean to the Channel more easily than the Genoese galleys which opposed Edward III. Once these had passed the Straits of Dover they could have isolated England. It was of the utmost importance that France should be weakened. Nevertheless Englishmen realised that they were paying a heavy price. A contemporary wrote "Woe is me! Mighty men and the treasure of this realm will be fordone about this business."

Fortune favoured Henry. Paris must have suffered when the Seine, her great waterway, was closed. In May 1418, just before Henry laid siege to Rouen, the capital of Normandy, the Burgundian faction in Paris rose against the Armagnacs. The Dauphin escaped, but the Count of Armagnac was murdered, and Duke John became the guardian of the mad King Charles. Rouen, left without adequate support, succumbed; and Henry became the ruler of Normandy. Negotiations were commenced both with the Dauphin and with Duke John; but Henry's terms were so exorbitant that the war continued. In the summer of 1419 the Dauphin and the Duke agreed to forget

their feud and join in resisting the English invader. Duke John met the Dauphin at Montereau, and, as the Duke knelt to pay homage, he was murdered by the Dauphin's men. Once again French disunion was England's best ally. John's son and heir, Duke Philip of Burgundy, made peace with the English. Henry married Katherine of France and was recognised as the heir of his father-in-law, Charles VI.

For little more than two years Henry governed France as Regent for his insane father-in-law. These years were spent in war with the Frenchmen of the South, who supported the Dauphin. In 1422 Henry V. died from dysentery brought on by exposure. His infant son became Henry VI., and the Duke of Bedford, the baby-king's uncle, inherited the impossible task of ruling France and England. When, a few weeks later, Charles VI. died, Bedford's task was not made easier. Paris and the North accepted Henry VI. as King of France, but in the South the Dauphin was proclaimed as Charles VIII. Bedford's brother, the Duke of Gloucester, acted as Bedford's deputy in England, but his rule was nominal. The real power was entrusted by Parliament to a council of magnates. This subordination of the unifying and centralising power of the Crown to the authority of a committee of territorial lords was a marked feature of Lancastrian times. The effect such a policy was likely to produce can be traced in the history of Poland. In that land, governed nominally by elected kings and in fact by great landlords, agriculture was developed and manufacture stifled. The owners of land insisted on buying cheap foreign goods, and home industries, other than

agriculture, were not fostered. The people remained in an unprogressive, servile state, until the nation, weakened by internal disunion, ceased to exist. From such a fate England was saved by the victory of the Yorkists in the War of the Roses.

In 1423 the Council of Magnates ordered the sale of the navy which Henry V. had created. In 1452 two ships, "rotten and useless, practically constituted the royal navy of England." Statute laws and civic charters protected English merchants if the executive had enforced the law. But the English wool-growing lords supported armies of retainers and defied the law. The Flemish and Italian merchant bought and sold freely to lay and clerical magnates. English merchant shipping declined and England's naval power was further weakened. This is stated in the Libel (or little book) of English Policy, written in 1436 or 1437. In this book the trade of Europe, as far as it affected England, is concisely discussed.

The author begins with an earnest exhortation to the English to "cherish Marchandise, keepe the admyraltie, that we bee Masters of the narrowe see," and gives the Emperor's advice to Henry to keep Calais and Dover "as your tweyne eyne." Bruges is described as the great market for European goods. Thither went wool from Spain and Scotland, but this could not be woven into fine cloth without the addition of English wool; hence the author argues that the Flemish must starve if they quarrel with England. Constant stress is laid on the importance of a strong English navy. With this and her fortresses of Calais and Dover, England could close the narrow seas and

exclude Scotch, Germans, Portuguese, Spaniards, and Italians from their market in Flanders. Then, the writer says, England could live in peace, since none would dare to face the loss of their trade.

The Libel pleads for a united England, Wales, and Ireland; and, apart from the constant refrain, lordship of the sea, attention is called to one "principal matter," that England should abandon her system of unfair trade. The Libel does not find fault with the law of England; but it states plainly that the law was constantly evaded and broken, so that foreigners had advantages over Englishmen in the English markets, whilst in foreign markets Englishmen were forced to submit to such restrictions as foreigners chose to impose. In the Libel the policy of English fifteenth-century fiscal reformers was thus briefly stated. Henry VI., who became King at the age of one, inherited from his grandfather, Charles VI., a feeble brain. . In his reign the royal power, already seriously weakened, almost disappeared. The authority of Parliament dwindled with that of the King. A body passing statutes which were not obeyed could not command respect. Two parties divided England—Lancastrians, who favoured the existing state of things, and Yorkists, who advocated fiscal reform and centralisation. An appeal was made to the sword. The Yorkist victories paved the way for the protection of industry which gave England the glories of Tudor times.

Florence was a great buyer of the unfinished English cloth, which members of the Arte di Calimala dressed and dyed. For the Genoese who carried dyed

cloth from England and brought "Woll, Oyle, Woadashen, by vessel in the see, Cotton, Rochalum, and good gold of Genue," the writer of the Libel has no more dislike than he has for the Germans, who also bought dyed stuffs and sold us bacon, bowstaves, materials for making beer, and naval stores. He speaks well, too, of the trade with the Portuguese, and expresses the hope that they will not imitate the Spanish and deal directly with the Flemish. But he has few good words to say of the Venetians and the Florentines.

"The great Galees of Venice and Florence
Be well laden with things of complacence,
All spicery and of grossers ware:
With sweet wines all manner of chaffare,
Apes and Japes, and marmusets tayled,
Nifles and trifles that little have avayled;
And things with which they fetely blere our eye:
With things not enduring that we bye.
For much of this chaffare that is wastable
Might be forborne for dere and deceivable."

The economic policy of the Libel very closely resembles the policy of modern protectionists. Complementary imports—that is, those for which no substitute can be found at home—should be encouraged, especially if the materials can be used in English industries. Rival products should be as far as possible kept out of England, and no foreigner should have any advantage over Englishmen in the English market, but the treatment of foreigners should be similar to that which they accord to the English who trade in their lands. The Lombards, in particular, are accused of evading the protective laws of England, and this

doubtless accounts for the dislike of these merchants expressed in the Libel.

The Hanseatic League was an important factor in the England of Henry VI. At one time three groups of cities were included in this confederation: the Dutch, the North Germans, under the leadership of Lübeck, and the West Germans, led by Cologne. The merchants from Cologne were the first to engage in the Anglo-Flemish trade. The North Germans began life humbly enough as fishermen who caught herrings off the south coast of Sweden which was subject to the King of Denmark. Their fishing fleet became a trading fleet, and by force of arms they subjected Norway to their economic control in 1285. Successors to the trade of the Northmen, Wisby became their most important trade centre in the Baltic. In the middle of the fourteenth century the Danes fought to crush the growing power of the German cities. Wisby was destroyed, and a great Scandinavian Empire might have been created had not the other groups united with the North German in an offensive and defensive alliance.

Under the headship of Cologne, sixty-seven cities united in 1364. Denmark was reduced to subjection in 1370. In 1397, Denmark, Norway and Sweden were united; but the economic power of the League was then too firmly established, and the Baltic became a *mare clausum* in which none but the Germans might trade.

Fishing for herrings was a very ancient industry in England. In 1238 mention is made of ships coming from the Baltic to Yarmouth for cargoes of English

fish. In 1394 measures had to be taken to prevent foreigners from using the Yorkshire coast as the North Germans used the coast of Sweden. The London fishmongers failed in their struggle to keep the English market for English-caught fish. In 1435 a statute was passed authorising the sale of foreign fish in spite of the charters of the fishmongers. Fishing should have been a natural industry to islanders like the English; but as late as the seventeenth century the Dutch claimed the right to fish English waters as if they belonged to Holland. Then at last protection gave the English a fishing industry as it had given her supremacy in the making of cloth. The barons of the Cinque Ports were also governors or conservators of the Yarmouth herring fair. Thus they were peculiarly responsible for the English navy and the English fishing industry.

Whilst Henry V. was fighting in France, war broke out between the Scandinavian powers and the North German cities. The Dutch left the League and fought in alliance with the Scandinavians. Had the English not been pre-occupied with the French war they might have joined in the war and opened the Baltic. As it was, the war ended in favour of the North Germans in 1435, although both the Dutch and the English refused to admit the Hanseatic claim to a monopoly of the Baltic trade, and unofficial war on the sea continued. This purely commercial war was fought with great ferocity, since each side considered their foes to be pirates and gave no quarter. In the treaties made with the North Germans by Richard II., English merchants were promised freedom of trade in the

Baltic in return for the freedom granted to the Hanse merchants in England, but the numerous acts of violence recited in these treaties prove that the merchants of the League had no intention of allowing the English access to the Baltic. England had no reason to complain of the merchants of Cologne; but the merchants, who are supposed to have called themselves at one time the brotherhood of St. Thomas Becket, had become the Merchant Adventurers, and in seeking to extend England's commerce they naturally resented the closure of the Baltic by the North Germans.

During the early years of Henry VI. Bedford devoted his energies to establishing Henry's authority in France. Recruits for the Anglo-Burgundian army were readily obtained in England, whilst there was a steady stream of Scotchmen into the ranks of Charles VII. In 1406 James, the heir to the throne of Scotland, was captured by the English whilst sailing to France. He was restored to the Scotch in 1423, after receiving an English education, and repaid his English friends by stopping the exodus of soldiers from Scotland. In wealth, the allies of England, the Low Countries, and Northern France must have been superior to the Frenchmen of the South, in spite of the valuable Mediterranean trade. But, whilst the Northerners, preoccupied by internal strife, gave but grudgingly to the Anglo-Burgundian cause, the Southerners spent their lives and money freely for Charles VII. There was so little loyalty among the allies that, in 1423, Gloucester married Jacqueline of Hainault, hoping to gain her heritage of Holland, which Duke Philip of Burgundy had marked as his

own. The Anglo-Burgundian alliance was nearly wrecked when Gloucester, in 1425, crossed the Channel to seize the land he coveted. The Londoners approved of Gloucester's design, and showed their sympathy by rising against those who had tried to supplant Gloucester when he was making his unsuccessful campaign in the Low Countries. Civil war was only averted by Bedford's return. During Bedford's absence of sixteen months the French war was badly managed, and the time then lost was never recovered.

Whilst the Anglo-Burgundians became lukewarm and disunited, the French King's adherents gained courage. For a little over a year French patriotism was inspired by the sight of a girl-heroine, Joan of Arc, who claimed that God had sent her to lead her countrymen to certain victory. Under her guidance the French won some remarkable victories; but, during the eight months which preceded her capture in 1430, she was used to inspire confidence, not to direct the campaign. It is no disparagement to the services which Joan of Arc rendered to France to suggest that the vacillation of the Duke of Burgundy contributed largely towards the success of the French.

The change in the economic relations between England and Flanders is quite sufficient to account for the dissolution of the Anglo-Burgundian alliance. Heavy cloth, in which there was much wool, could be more cheaply manufactured in England, since the Flemish could only buy English wool burdened with heavy export duties. Lighter fabrics could not as yet be made in England, and in order to weave these the Flemish had urgent need of English wool. The

Flemish had advantages over the English in the dressing and dyeing of both heavy and light cloth. Hence, whilst one branch of Flemish weaving was being ruined by English competition and the industry as a whole was threatened by the probable development of English cloth-making, the Flemish found it difficult to retaliate on a nation which had a monopoly of the raw material on which all branches depended.

In 1429 the English Parliament passed a statute to check the practice of evading the payment of export duties on wool carried to Flanders. In 1434 the Flemish forbade the importation of English cloth, and in the same year Philip of Burgundy made a secret agreement with Charles VII. In 1435 negotiations for an Anglo-French peace failed because England refused to restore Normandy; the secret agreement became the formal treaty of Arras; and in 1436 the Flemish besieged Calais. The weavers of Ghent were foremost in responding to the Duke's request that his subjects should attack their old allies, the English. But, although some Flemish weavers were being ruined by English competition, there were many weavers of lighter fabrics in Flanders who had need of English wool, and Flemish cloth finishers were ready to dress and dye English cloth. Scotch and Spanish wool could be bought in Flanders, but these could not be used until they were mixed with English wool. When commerce with England was suspended the zeal of the besiegers of Calais flagged. In spite of the Duke's entreaties the Flemish returned to their homes, and civil war, caused by divergent economic interests, made Flanders a negligible quantity in the Anglo-

French duel. In the treaty of Arras Charles waived his claim to suzerainty over Flanders during Duke Philip's life; but, when their dukes tried to abolish the old privileges by which each Flemish city tried to get the better of its neighbours, they met with a resistance similar to that formerly offered to the invading kings of France.

Just before the treaty of Arras was signed Bedford died. Both Gloucester and the Duke of York were left with claims to the throne of England if the boy-king died without issue. But at first Gloucester and York united in opposing the powerful Beauforts, illegitimate descendants of John of Gaunt, who had been legitimised by Parliament but declared incapable of inheriting the Crown. Cardinal Henry Beaufort, supported by his nephew the Earl of Somerset and by the Earl of Suffolk, a descendant of the merchant family of de la Pole, led a party which desired peace with Flanders and France. Gloucester and York were both naturally in favour of retaining the King's possessions in France. For fourteen years after the treaty of Arras, the English grew more and more discontented with the misgovernment of the magnates. In 1450 popular discontent found expression in Cade's rebellion; and although this failed, it was soon followed by the War of the Roses which put an end to parliamentary misrule.

# XIV

## THE WAR OF THE ROSES

### 1440–1471

A STATUTE restricting the franchise in the shires to those who owned landed property of an annual value of not less than twenty shillings was passed in 1430 while the King was a child. Thus when Henry VI. became old enough to govern he was surrounded by barons who kept small armies of retainers and who could fill Parliament with their partisans. Had the magnates abstained from quarrelling with each other, and had they allied themselves with the merchants, the English monarchy and English freedom would probably have been destroyed. The magnates appear to have sought to conciliate the wealthy citizens when the free sale of foreign fish was allowed in 1435, and when in 1439 a statute was passed re-enacting the restrictions on foreign merchants. In 1440 an Anglo-Flemish commercial treaty was signed. This truce lasted nine years. In 1449 the weavers of the Netherlands again insisted upon a prohibition of the importation of cheap English cloth, and the English retaliated by forbidding all intercourse with the Low Countries.

The Hanse merchants played an important part in the commercial struggle between England and Flanders.

As middlemen they insisted on being allowed to carry either wool or cloth. When the Flemish declined to accept English cloth, the Hanseats refused to supply Flanders with wool, and the Flemish were obliged to yield. Although the League aided England in their commercial war with Flanders, the North Germans, in spite of their treaties, refused to allow English Merchant Adventurers entrance into the Baltic. From 1438 to 1441 the Dutch fought their former comrades of the League to gain admittance into the Baltic; but, in spite of the treaty of 1441, the North Germans insisted on their claim to exclude foreigners. The Scandinavian kingdoms also tried to throw off the yoke of the League. They were, however, so inferior to the North Germans in sea power that they could only secretly encourage the Victual Brothers, independent sea rovers who were treated as pirates by the League.

De Witt has left a picture of England as foreigners saw her in the fifteenth century. "As for England, we are to know that heretofore it wholly subsisted by Husbandry, and was wont to be so naked of any Naval Power that the Hans-Towns being at War with England, they compelled King Edward in the Year 1470 to make peace upon Terms of Advantage to them. And so long as the English used to transport nothing but a few Minerals, and much Wool, which they carried to Calais by a small number of their own Ships, and sold only to Netherlandish Clothiers, it would have been so prejudicial for the King to forbear his Customs of Wool (which at Calais alone amounted to 50,000 Crowns per annum, and likewise to the Sub-

ject, in case he had made War upon the Netherlands) that we read not that these trading Provinces ever broke out into a perfect open War against England. For the sometimes War hapned between the Princes of the respective Countrys, nevertheless most of the Citys concerned in Traffick and Drapery continued in Amity."

In 1447 the naval weakness of England tempted the League to enact that no English goods should be carried except on Hanseatic ships. The French had been steadily driving the English from the lands they had conquered. In 1440 the captive Duke of Orleans was released owing to the influence of the peace party. It was intended that Orleans should act as peace-maker between France and England, but the war continued. In 1442 the idea of peace was revived; and it was suggested that Henry should marry a daughter of the powerful Count of Armagnac. At this time the French magnates, led by Armagnac, were uniting against Charles VII., so that the proposed marriage might have led to peace on favourable terms for the English. In 1443, when Charles and his magnates were reconciled, Suffolk crossed the Channel and negotiated a truce for two years by surrendering English claims. At the same time he arranged that Henry should marry Margaret of Anjou, the daughter of a landless French noble. It was becoming abundantly clear that the English, with a weakened navy, would have to face the hostility of the Germans in the North Sea and of the French in the Channel when France regained possession of the coast.

To keep power over Parliament the Government

accused the sheriffs of having "tampered with the returns to Parliament, ignoring men duly elected, and substituting nominees of their own." In 1445 legislation was passed to secure that "Knyghtes of the Shire . . . hereafter to be chosen be . . . gentilmen of birth"; not yeomen, nor "bynethe." Having thus silenced the democracy, the peace party determined to attack Gloucester and York. In 1447 Parliament met at Bury St. Edmunds, where the influence of the London mob would not be felt. Gloucester was arrested and died before trial. His death was followed by the appointment of York to the Lieutenancy of Ireland for ten years, an honourable form of banishment. Repeated surrenders to the French prolonged the truce until 1449. Then Parliament met in Westminster, and before it was dissolved the Anglo-French war was resumed. It was soon manifest that England's possessions in France were doomed, and there was grave danger that England would be invaded. Above all things it was important that Calais should not be lost. As long as Dover and Calais were in English hands, the armed merchantmen of England could interpose between the French and North German fleets. If France had had an adequate navy or the North Germans an adequate army nothing could have saved England, since her coasts were so defenceless that in 1450 it was an everyday occurrence for a walk along the coast to end on board an enemy's ship.

Though there was great distress in England and the King was penniless, the peace party had been prospering. Cardinal Beaufort died in 1447, leaving great wealth behind him. His nephew and Suffolk

were rewarded for their mismanagement by being created Dukes of Somerset and of Suffolk. In addition to England's other troubles, in 1449 the importation of English cloth into Brabant, Holland, and Zeeland was prohibited. A new Parliament was summoned to meet at Westminster in November 1449. In spite of the efforts of the peace party, this Parliament was hostile to Suffolk. In order to protect his minister from the anger of the people, Henry banished him for five years; but, on his way to the Continent, Suffolk was intercepted and beheaded by English sailors who were lying in wait for him. Parliament insisted that all royal grants made during the King's reign should be revoked. This order was, however, imperfectly obeyed. Normandy was lost to the English in 1450. The men of Kent rose under Jack Cade. The insurgents demanded a change of government and the recall of the Duke of York from Ireland. Though the rebellion was suppressed, York resigned the Lieutenancy of Ireland and became the leader of the opposition to the Government. In 1451 the South of France was lost to the English. York was apparently about to succeed, when he listened to an invitation to make peace with Somerset. York's demands were nominally conceded; he disbanded his forces and met the King, only to find that he was a prisoner in the hands of his enemies. Somerset, however, feared to take extreme measures against a popular leader, and York acquiesced in Somerset's rule.

In 1452 the English were cheered by some successes. At a diet held at Utrecht a majority of the Hanse cities made favourable terms with the English

commissioners. The citizens of Ghent, in arms against their Duke on account of certain taxes, sought and obtained aid from England. The merchants of Bordeaux, anxious once more to exchange wine for English cloth, also obtained help from England and expelled the French. The Parliament, which met in this year at Reading to be free from the influence of the Yorkist Londoners, supported Somerset and the King. But clouds soon gathered. Lübeck refused to accept the arrangement made at Utrecht. The merchants of Cologne were allowed to enjoy the privileges of the London Steelyard, whilst those of Lübeck continued the commercial war with England. The League was temporarily divided ; but the English were still excluded from the Baltic market for their cloth. In July 1453 twenty thousand citizens of Ghent perished at the battle of Gavre, and England's hope of recovering the Flemish market vanished. In Southern France Bordeaux only was holding its own with difficulty, against the French. In October Bordeaux yielded, and another market was permanently closed. The foreign possessions of England were reduced to the fortress of Calais.

To add to England's troubles the King's mind, never very strong, gave way ; and he was unable even to understand that an heir to his difficulties had been born. Under these depressing conditions the Queen's desire to be made Regent was refused ; and Parliament in 1454 entrusted York with the office of Protector. Somerset was at the same time lodged in the Tower, lest a worse fate should befall him. Next year the King recovered from his insanity. Somerset was

reinstated, and both parties drew the sword. The first battle of St. Albans ended in a victory for the Yorkists. Somerset was killed in battle ; York became Constable of England, whilst his supporter, the Earl of Warwick, was made Captain of Calais. In 1456 the Queen removed her husband and son to the Midlands. The Yorkists were then deprived of power ; but for three years there was no fresh outbreak of civil war. In 1457, owing to reverses at sea, the Queen was forced to give Warwick a commission to keep the sea for three years, and Warwick succeeded where his predecessor had failed.

In 1459 the Queen thought that she was strong enough to crush the Yorkists. Both sides armed, and the battles of Blore Heath and Ludlow proved that the Queen's calculations were well founded. The Yorkists made the mistake of trusting to their retainers and fighting at a distance from London and Kent, the centres of their strength. Before the end of the year the leading Yorkists were in exile. York was again sent to Ireland and Warwick withdrew to Calais, which he held in opposition to the Government. Though defeated on land, the Yorkists had the support of England's sailors and of the men of Kent. In London many of the rich merchants were Lancastrian, but the great majority of the common folk were on the side of York.

Warwick landed in Kent in 1460. He was welcomed by the citizens of London. Money was raised in the city; at Northampton the Lancastrians were crushed; and York returned to London with a captive King, who was allowed to reign under York's tutelage,

whilst York was recognised as the heir to the throne. The Queen speedily raised a new army in the North. At Wakefield, in 1460, York was defeated and killed in the battle. A Lancastrian victory at St. Albans in February 1461 ought to have opened the road to London; but the Queen hesitated before attacking a Yorkist stronghold. Meanwhile York's son and heir, soon to be Edward IV., had defeated the Lancastrians of the West at Mortimer's Cross. His victorious army joined Warwick's force which had been defeated at St. Albans, and London accepted Edward as King. Henry VI. had escaped from the custody of the Yorkists when they were defeated at St. Albans. The new king pursued the Lancastrians as they retired towards the North and defeated them at Towton. Henry VI. and his Queen fled to Scotland, and, in 1461, Parliament recognised that Edward IV. was King by right of birth and not by parliamentary title.

The Yorkist cause had been supported by the common folk, weavers and ironworkers. They were rewarded in 1463 when Parliament decreed that the importation of a long list of cutlery and ironware was forbidden during the King's pleasure and that no wrought silk should be imported for five years. At the same time the export of wool was confined to Englishmen, and to encourage agriculture the importation of grain was forbidden until the price was high enough to allow English farmers to grow grain at a profit. This, the first English corn law, if statutes permitting or forbidding the exportation of grain are neglected, preserved England from having her corn-

growing ruined by the importation of cheap grain from the Baltic. Next year the importation of woollen cloth was forbidden. The preambles to these statutes make it quite clear that they were intended to protect English industry. During the civil war, as a rule, the common folk were spared, while noble prisoners were executed without mercy. The slaughter of so many magnates made it easier to carry into effect the idealism of de Montfort who, two centuries before England was ripe for the change, had urged Englishmen to protect the English weaver instead of seeking over-precious raiment from abroad.

In the year 1453, when the War of the Roses was brewing, the Turks captured Constantinople. Materials from the East, such as alum, without which cloth could not then be finished, were only to be had at whatever price the Turks chose to ask. John di Castro, a refugee from Constantinople, obtained the Pope's permission to open mines in papal territory. An abundance of excellent alum was produced at some date between 1460 and 1465. Shortly after this alum was found at Volterra, not far from Florence. The Medici of Florence were papal bankers and financed the alum mines and works. After a war between Florence and Volterra, the Medici were able to control the supply of alum from Volterra as well as that from papal territory. The cloth of Florence was no longer sent to be dyed at Constantinople, and the Popes and Medici won colossal wealth from the discovery. The splendour and the wickedness of Rome and Florence under the Borgias and the Medici came from this easily earned wealth. Before the end

of the fifteenth century Florence, thinking herself secure in her monopoly of alum, adopted the policy of free importation. Cheap rough cloth was carried from England to be finished in Florence. The rich Medici grew richer, whilst the weavers starved and fought desperately for the right to exist. Meanwhile England increased her hold over the primary industry of weaving, and waited in patience for the secondary industries which were bound to come to her.

Portugal had been England's faithful political and commercial ally. The treaty of Windsor, in 1386, established this alliance, which was cemented by the marriage of Philippa of Lancaster, daughter of John of Gaunt, to King John of Portugal. Her son, Henry, was the Portuguese prince who led his countrymen on those voyages of discovery by which ultimately a sea route to the East round the Cape of Good Hope was found in 1486. Thus European progress was stimulated and not retarded when importation from the East was temporarily checked by the capture of Constantinople. Duke Philip of Flanders was evidently alive to the importance of Portugal when he married Philippa's daughter, Isabel, with great pomp in 1427; but the Portuguese remained faithful to their English friends, and the treaty of Windsor was constantly renewed. Charles the Bold, son of Philip and Isabel, was the real ruler of Flanders for some years before 1467, when he succeeded to the Duchy of Burgundy on his father's death.

In 1461, the year in which Edward IV. was crowned, Charles VII. of France died, and his son, Louis XI., became King. From Louis, Queen Margaret obtained

shipping and men. But the rivalry which existed between the Duke of Burgundy and Louis XI. made the French King cautious. English shipping was able to cope with the insufficient force obtained from France, and Queen Margaret again found shelter in Scotland. A Lancastrian rising in the North of England, supported by the Scotch, was crushed in 1464 at the battles of Hedgely Moor and Hexham. Scotland then made peace with Edward; Queen Margaret fled to France; and Henry VI. found hiding-places in the houses of his English adherents. Fear of the power of the King of France prevented an open rupture between England and the Netherlands when commercial intercourse was suspended.

After 1458 short commercial truces between England and Flanders enabled English merchants to conduct a somewhat precarious trade. In the second year of his reign Edward tried to establish an English Hanse in the Netherlands by the grant of a "large charter" to English merchants trading in those parts. Commercial treaties were also made with Denmark, Brittany, Scotland, Naples, and Spain. To facilitate the conclusion of the treaty with Spain a present of English sheep was sent to the Spanish King, and it is supposed that the growing of fine wool in Spain began after this gift. In 1463 a Navigation Act was passed to compel English exporters to use English ships; but this Act lapsed in three years and was probably never seriously enforced. To raise funds for an adequate navy was too dangerous a policy before the central government was strong enough to crush opposition to national taxation; but Edward doubt-

less hoped to restore England's sea power by building up a mercantile marine. He became a trader on his own account, and his marriage to an Englishwoman, Elizabeth Woodville, who was only the daughter of a knight, endeared the King to the middle classes, although it tended to estrange the great nobles.

Edward's attempt to establish direct commerce with the Netherlands alarmed the weavers of Flanders. It was immediately followed by a Burgundian edict prohibiting the importation of English cloth. This was answered by an English Act forbidding importation from Burgundian lands; but the Act specified that the rights of the Steelyard were not to be affected, hence Anglo-Flemish trade passed into the hands of the merchants of Cologne. The commerce of Calais was affected by Edward's "large charter," which was intended to create direct intercourse between Flanders and England, and by the Act which confined Anglo-Flemish trade to the merchants of the Steelyard who dealt between London and Bruges. When Charles the Bold became Duke of Burgundy in 1467, negotiations for an alliance between Charles and Edward were set on foot. The alliance involved joint action against France and direct commercial intercourse between the Burgundian lands and England. It was to be cemented by the marriage of Edward's sister, Margaret, to Duke Charles.

Warwick, whose interests were bound up with Calais and English shipping, opposed the alliance and the treaties; but a treaty which restored commerce with the Netherlands was evidently better than the absolute cessation of trade. Hence the merchants of

Calais supported Edward in his new policy, although this policy involved their obtaining a smaller share of Anglo-Flemish trade. The treaties were signed and the marriage solemnised after Parliament had signified its approval in 1468. Then followed a rising of nobles who were jealous of the favours bestowed on the Queen's relatives. Warwick and Edward's brother, the Duke of Clarence, supported this rebellion. After a small battle at Edgecote, Edward fell into the hands of the rebels. This sudden revolt was succeeded by an equally sudden reaction. Edward was set free, and Warwick in 1470 fled to Calais. Refused admittance at Calais, Warwick obtained ships and men from Louis XI. and sheltered himself in the mouth of the Seine, where he was blockaded by the Duke of Burgundy. Before long Duke Charles was forced to raise the blockade. There were naval battles between the Hanseatics and Flemings on one side and Warwick on the other, although England and Burgundy were allied. Finally, in 1470, after making peace with Queen Margaret, Warwick landed at Dartmouth. Edward fled to Flanders, and Henry VI. was released from the Tower to serve as puppet King for Warwick.

It was not long before England again learned that internal peace was impossible as long as her navy was weak. After some hesitation, Duke Charles lent his brother-in-law some ships, and money with which he could hire others from the Hanse merchants. In 1471 Edward landed in England. Clarence deserted Warwick's cause, and London again welcomed a Yorkist King. Warwick was routed and slain at the battle of Barnet in 1471. On the day of the battle

Queen Margaret landed at Weymouth. Three weeks later the Lancastrians who had joined her were defeated at Tewkesbury. Edward, the only son of Henry VI., was put to death after the battle, and Queen Margaret surrendered to Edward. Warwick's Vice-Admiral, Fauconbridge, led his sailors to London. He was defeated by the resistance of the Londoners, and resumed his old career of pirate, until he was captured and beheaded. Edward entered London as unquestioned King. On the day of his entry Henry VI. died a probably unnatural death in the Tower, and for a time England had rest from civil war.

# XV

## ENGLAND'S PROTECTIVE POLICY INITIATED

### 1473–1490

EDWARD IV. was restored to his throne by Duke Charles the Bold ; but there was little to unite the two rulers except their common hostility to Louis XI. Charles wished to create an independent Greater Burgundy which should stretch from the Low Countries to the Mediterranean. Within his kingdom there would have been ample pasture for flocks whose wool might have fed Flemish looms. Charles even dreamed of adding England to his dominions. After the death of Henry VI. he placed on record a secret document in which he claimed the throne of England as a descendant of John of Gaunt through his mother. But the first task to which Charles devoted his energy was the conquest of the lands which separated Flemish looms from the Burgundian pastures. To aid him in his enterprise, Charles negotiated with the Dukes of Guienne and Brittany and with Edward IV., who was invited to enter France by way of Brittany.

Co-operation with the English was impossible until the English could cross the Channel in safety. Accordingly Charles arranged a meeting of the Hanse merchants and the English at Utrecht in 1473, when

peace was made between the North Germans and the English. The feud between Cologne and the Baltic towns was then healed, and Lübeck again became the chief Hanse city. The North Germans regained the privileges of the Steelyard, promising to give English merchants equal freedom in the Baltic. This promise was, however, speedily broken. Charles promised Edward the support of the Flemish in the campaign against Louis; but the merchants declined to listen to the Duke's prayers and threats. In 1475 Edward wisely sailed to Calais instead of Brittany. When it was clear that Charles would have no help from Flanders, Edward made terms with Louis XI. The campaign was abandoned after Edward had received a large sum of money from the French King and a promise of an annual subsidy. It was also agreed that the Dauphin should marry Edward's daughter Elizabeth. The marriage project failed; but the subsidy was regularly paid during Edward's life, and he was thus relieved from the necessity of summoning Parliament.

In 1476 French gold was used to bribe the Swiss to attack Charles and to spread treachery in the Burgundian army. Charles fell at the battle of Nancy, leaving an only child, Mary, as heiress. The Flemish burghers at first saw in the disaster an opportunity for wringing from the duchess and her mother a renewal of the privileges which had divided the Netherlands. When Louis realised profit from his judicious investments by annexing large portions of the Burgundian lands, and when he threatened to absorb the Netherlands by marrying the Dauphin to their young Duchess,

the burghers awoke to their danger. An army, tenfold as large as that which Duke Charles had asked for, was hastily levied, and Mary was married to Maximilian, son of the German Emperor. Thus for a time absolute ruin was averted; but, in the end, the men who preferred to depend on the foreigner for their raw material, wool, and who thought as traders not as imperialists, lost both trade and freedom.

Edward's interference in foreign politics almost ceased after 1475. The money he received from France, supplemented by benevolences or compulsory gifts from wealthy merchants, enabled him to rule without Parliament. One Parliament, indeed, met in 1478; but the only business it transacted was the condemnation of Edward's brother, the Duke of Clarence, for high treason. Clarence died in the Tower before the sentence of Parliament was carried out. Parliament did not again meet until 1483, just before Edward's death. In 1478 a commercial treaty was made between England and Flanders. Next year Philip, the baby son of Maximilian and Mary, was betrothed to one of Edward's daughters. Flanders and France were at war and this was probably a hint to the French King that there might be an Anglo-Burgundian alliance if his payments were not punctually made.

The last years of Edward's life were devoted mainly to Scotland. Advantage was taken of the Franco-Burgundian war and of disunion in the Scotch royal family. The Duke of Albany, brother of the reigning King James III., laid claim to the throne, and Edward supported Albany's claim. In return Albany

promised to acknowledge Edward's overlordship if he won the throne of Scotland. But in March 1482 Mary of Burgundy died, leaving two infant children, Philip and Margaret. Whilst Edward and Albany were making terms, Louis XI. was negotiating with the Flemish, and it was agreed that the Dauphin should marry Margaret, who would have as dowry the Burgundian lands for which France was fighting. France was thus able to interest herself in the affairs of Scotland, and in the midst of a successful campaign which Edward's brother Richard, Duke of Gloucester, was conducting against James of Scotland, Albany resigned his claim and made terms with his brother. As the result of the war England gained only the frontier town of Berwick, but Gloucester acquired the reputation of a great military leader.

The negotiations between France and the Low Countries, which were finally concluded by the Peace of Arras in March 1483, were at once felt in England. The motive, prompting Louis to pay the annual bribe, which had lessened taxation in England, was removed when Edward's neutrality was no longer of value to the French King. France could then interfere to check the movement towards the unification of Great Britain, and the trade between England and the Low Countries was endangered. When England wished to sell cloth instead of wool Bruges closed her market in 1434, only to create a dangerous rival in Antwerp, the sea port of Brabant. There English Merchant Adventurers settled in 1446, and Antwerp, accepting the principle of free trade, offered a hearty welcome to all merchants of every nation.

The Hanse League had much capital invested in Bruges, and were therefore loth to leave. But as the trade of Bruges decayed, the Zwyn silted up. Charles the Bold urged his semi-independent Flemish towns to aid Bruges in clearing the waterway, but they turned a deaf ear. Antwerp grew as Bruges declined, and the Hanse merchants followed the English. Then followed the dramatic commercial war of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Cheap English goods flooded the Low Countries and Germany. At first there was plenty for the poor and luxury for the rich, soon followed by loss of production, ruin, and desolation. It was this market of Antwerp which might have been closed to the English by the Peace of Arras.

Parliament met in January 1483, and supply for the Anglo-French war which seemed inevitable was at once voted. Shortly after Parliament was prorogued Edward died in April 1483, and his son, a boy of twelve, became Edward V. By illegal and violent measures the young King's uncle, Gloucester, was made Protector, and the sons of Edward IV. were lodged in the Tower. In June the Protector obtained the consent of the nobles to his usurpation of the throne as Richard III. A few days after this the boy-king and his brother were murdered in the Tower. The conscience of the nation was again shocked when Richard's wife, whose health precluded the possibility of her bearing more children, died suddenly, after Richard was left childless by the death of his only son. The shock was increased when Richard proposed to marry his niece Elizabeth, the sister of the

murdered children. Englishmen believed not without some reason that Richard had murdered Henry VI., his brother Clarence, his two nephews, and his wife. Though Richard's Parliament passed statutes making benevolences illegal and protecting English trade against foreign competition, his reign was destined to be a short one.

Henry Tudor, Earl of Richmond, a descendant of the Beauforts, had fled to the Continent. Arrangements were made by which he was to land in England, seize the Crown, marry Edward's daughter Elizabeth, and thus put an end to the strife between the Houses of York and Lancaster. In 1483 Richard succeeded in suppressing a rebellion to carry out this scheme; but in 1485 Henry landed at Milford Haven with a small body of soldiers lent by the French. Richard was defeated and killed near Bosworth; and Henry was informally crowned on the field of battle. His formal coronation took place in October 1485; and almost immediately Parliament met and gave its sanction. In January 1486 Henry married Elizabeth, and the long feud between York and Lancaster was healed.

In 1621, when the advantage which England had gained from protection was patent to all, Lord Bacon wrote of Henry VII. that "the King also (having care to make his realm potent as well by sea as by land), for the better maintenance of the navy, ordained that wines and woads from the ports of Gascoign and Languedoc should not be brought but in English bottoms; bowing the ancient policy of this estate from consideration of plenty to consideration of power: for that almost all the ancient statutes invite

(by all means) merchant strangers to bring in all sorts of commodities, having for end cheapness, and not looking to the point of state concerning the naval power." If it is possibly too much to claim for Henry the inauguration of the protective policy, he and his descendants made England great by loyally adhering to it.

In a speech which Bacon puts in the mouth of Henry's Chancellor at the opening of Parliament, the Chancellor states that the King "prays you to take into consideration matters of trade, as also the manufactures of the kingdom, and to repress the bastard and barren employment of moneys to usury and unlawful exchanges, that they may be (as their natural use is) turned upon commerce and lawful and royal trading; and likewise that our people may be set awork in arts and handicrafts, that the realm may subsist more of itself, that idleness be avoided, and the draining out of our treasure for foreign manufacture stopped. But you are not to rest here only, but to provide further that whatsoever merchandise shall be brought in from beyond the seas may be employed upon the commodities of this land, whereby the kingdom's stock of treasure may be sure to be kept from being diminished by any overtrading of the foreigner."

When mentioning a law which forbade the importation of certain silk goods, Bacon says that "this law pointed at a true principle; that where foreign materials are but superfluities, foreign manufactures should be prohibited. For that will either banish the superfluity or gain the manufacture."

Laws were passed compelling importers of foreign "merchandise brought in from beyond the seas" to buy an equivalent amount of English goods, so that imports were paid for by exports and checking the "barren employment of moneys" so that rich Englishmen could not, like the Fuggers and Medici, send capital abroad to earn interest by giving employment to foreigners. In a popular poem written after the protective statutes of Edward IV. the following quaint advice was given:

"Therefore let not our wool be sold for nought,
Neither our cloth, for they must be sought,
And in especial restrain straightly the wool,
That the commons of this land may work at the full.
And if any wool be sold of this land,
Let it be of the worst both to free and bond,
And none other in (no) manner wise,
For many causes, as I can devise.
If the wool be coarse, the cloth is much the worse,
Yet into little they put out of purse,
As much for carding, spinning, and weaving,
Fulling, rowing, dyeing, and shearing.
And yet when such cloth is all wrought,
To the maker it availeth little or nought.
The price is simple, the cost is never the less,
They that worked such wool in wit be like an ass.
The cost within little truly at the full
Is as much as it were made of the fine wool,
Yet a yard of that one is worth five of the other;
Better can not I say, though it were to my brother."

This somewhat unscrupulous policy was carried out by enacting that the foreigner should not be allowed to buy English wool until the English weaver had enjoyed an option for six months after shearing

time. No cloth might leave England until it had been "barbed, rowed, and shorn." For centuries the importation of foreign cloth was forbidden, except during a few years when Oliver Cromwell's army governed England. The keystone of England's fiscal policy was this forcing the rich to support the poor weaver and not "to seek over-precious raiment." Iron-ware was prohibited during the King's pleasure in the reign of Edward IV. It is evident the English production was then insufficient, and the King was therefore invited to regulate the importation. In the short reign of Richard III. the importation was given as a monopoly to English merchants; but as these goods came from the Low Countries, with whom commerce was frequently interrupted, a great stimulus was given to home production. The prohibition was not made absolute until the reign of Elizabeth; but from 1354 the exportation of iron was prohibited, thus a supply of raw material was ensured.

The Wars of the Roses were fought by armies of retainers, who wore the livery of great nobles in token of their readiness to support the cause of their leaders, whilst these leaders maintained or protected their followers in the King's courts. Juries were afraid to convict; and the laws against livery and maintenance, which were continually enacted from 1327 onwards, were inoperative, since the offence of maintenance was repeated when offences against these statutes came into court. A new court, which obtained the name of Star Chamber, was established at the commencement of Henry's reign. It was composed of the Chancellor, Treasurer, Privy Seal, a bishop, a lay lord

of the Privy Council, and two judges. Offences against the statutes of livery and maintenance were removed to this court, which could not be terrorised. The King's treasury was filled by heavy fines levied on disobedient nobles, and the King's peace replaced feudal disorder.

The magnates were, however, unwilling to beat their swords into ploughshares. The growth of weaving had made sheep farming more profitable than agriculture, and landlords were taking advantage of Enclosure Acts such as the Statute of Merton. "Inclosures at that time began to be more frequent, whereby arable land (which could not be cultivated without people and families) was turned into pasture, which was easily rid by a few herdsmen; and tenances for years, lives, and at will (whereupon much of the yeomanry lived) were turned into demesnes. This bred a decay of people. . . . In remedying of this inconvenience the King's wisdom was admirable; and the Parliament's at that time. Inclosures they would not forbid, for that had been to forbid the improvement of the patrimony of the kingdom; nor tillage they would not compel, for that was to strive with Nature and utility: but they took a course to take away depopulating inclosures and depopulating pasturage, and yet not by that name, or by any imperious express prohibition, but by consequence.

"The ordinance was, 'That all houses of husbandry, that were used with twenty acres of ground and upwards, should be maintained and kept up for ever; together with a competent proportion of land to be used and occupied with them' (as by another statute,

made afterwards in his successor's time was more fully declared) ; this upon forfeiture to be taken, not by way of popular action, but by seizure of the land itself by the King and lords of the fee, as to half the profits, till the houses and lands were restored. By this means the houses being kept up did of necessity enforce a dweller ; and the proportion of land being kept up, did of necessity enforce that dweller not to be a beggar or cottager, but a man of some substance, that might keep hinds and servants, and set the plough on going." After describing the service which this yeoman class could render to the military strength of England, Lord Bacon adds : " Thus did the King secretly sow Hydra's teeth ; whereupon (according to the poet's fiction) should rise up armed men for the service of the kingdom." Bacon had personal experience of the effect of this policy.

Much was done by Henry VII. to found English commerce upon England's production of cheap cloth. When the Venetians, alarmed at the appearance of English shipping in the Eastern Mediterranean, imposed an export duty on Cretan wines loaded on foreign ships and gave bounties to their own wine-exporters, Parliament retaliated by placing a heavy import duty on wine carried by the Venetians. As a producer of cloth England had an overwhelming advantage in this commercial war. The trade of the Venetian middlemen in English cloth was swept away, when England in 1490 made a commercial treaty with Florence, the great centre of cloth-making in Italy. Florence, like Antwerp, accepted the principle of free trade. Cheap English cloth was imported in the hope

of retaining the secondary industry of dyeing and dressing when the primary industry of weaving was surrendered to England. In Florence, as in Flanders, this policy was followed by ephemeral prosperity, marred by civil wars which were the death throes of the weaving industry. Then followed in Florence, as in Flanders, loss of freedom and ruin. But protected England grew ever richer and her cloth was carried throughout the Mediterranean by English merchants on English ships.

It was much more difficult to deal with the Hanseatic League than with the Venetians. The treaty of Utrecht gave English merchants the same rights in the Baltic as Hanse merchants enjoyed in England, but these rights in the Baltic were withheld. Until England had built an adequate navy nothing could, however, be done; and English merchants were forced, from fear of the sea power of the League, to acquiesce in a policy of masterly inactivity. Indeed an Act was passed in the reign of Henry VII. expressly exempting Hanse merchants from any restrictive commercial legislation which Parliament might pass. But even the commerce and sea power of the Hanse League, lacking the only sure foundation of national production, contained within itself the seeds of decay. At least the foundation of England's Tudor navy was laid in the reign of Henry VII. and the first dry dock was constructed, although it was left for other Tudors to build on this foundation. A way into the Baltic was also opened by the treaty with Denmark in 1490; and through this entrance English ships sailed ultimately to wrest from Germans the commerce of the League.

## XVI

### SPAIN ENTERS INTO TRADE COMPETITION

1490–1509

THE greatest problem which confronted Henry was the phenomenal growth of Spain. Until 1479 Spain was divided into two large Christian States, Castile and Aragon, the small Mahomedan kingdom of Granada, and the still smaller Christian State of Navarre. Though Castile was three times the size of its eastern neighbour Aragon, this difference was partly compensated by the Aragonese possessions in the Mediterranean, Corsica and Sardinia, and by the control Aragon exercised over Sicily. The union of Castile and Aragon under Ferdinand and Isabella, which foreshadowed the absorption of Granada and Navarre, created a Spanish nation which occupied four-fifths of the Iberian peninsula. It seemed only too likely that Portugal, the remaining fifth, would also be permanently absorbed, as, somewhat later, it actually was united to Spain for sixty years.

Before the Catholic kings, Ferdinand, Isabella, and their successors, created national unity by asserting their royal power, Spanish nobles and Spanish Parliaments possessed even greater rights and freedom than the English had before the Tudors centralised

the government of England. There was more religious toleration in Spain than there was in England. Jews and Mahomedans worked side by side with Christians. The Spaniard excelled the English in manufactures, and, after Edward IV. sent the King of Aragon a present of English sheep, the wool of Spain became even finer than that of England. Live sheep had been sent to Spain in the reign of Edward III., but probably through carelessness in breeding Spanish wool was of inferior quality until after the reign of Edward IV. The success of the Portuguese in discovering the gold of Guinea and the sea route to the East was dwarfed when, in 1493, Ferdinand was told by Columbus of the discovery of America. A Pope had given the sanction of religion to the Portuguese monopoly of the sea route to the East and to the lands they had found in Africa. Another Pope, Alexander VI., a Spaniard by birth, gave Ferdinand and Isabella similar rights in the West. In the subsequent histories of Spain and England the effect of economic policy on national growth and national freedom can be clearly traced. Spain neglected her workers, and lost her freedom and colossal strength; whilst by pursuing an opposite policy England became both strong and free.

England could stop Spanish ships from passing Dover and Calais; Spain could exclude the English from the Mediterranean; hence a good understanding was important to both nations. After thirteen years of tedious negotiations Ferdinand's youngest daughter, Catherine, was married to Arthur, the eldest son of Henry VII. and heir to the throne of England. A few

months later Arthur died, and Henry, who was at the time a widower, sought to marry his daughter-in-law. When her mother Isabella vetoed this curious proposal, Catherine was married to her brother-in-law, afterwards Henry VIII.

An unhappy fate attended most of the carefully planned marriages of Ferdinand's five children. His eldest daughter, Isabella, married the Crown Prince of Portugal in 1490, only to become a widow in a few months' time. In 1497 she married her husband's cousin and successor, Emanuel, and died giving birth to a son, who also died in infancy. Ferdinand's third daughter, Maria, then became Emanuel's wife. Had Isabella's son lived he would have united Spain and Portugal, since Ferdinand's only son, Juan, died without issue in 1497. Between Maria and the Crown of Spain there were Ferdinand's second daughter, Juanna, and her two sons, Charles and Ferdinand. Just as Isabella and Maria were used to bring Portugal under Spanish control, so Juan and Juanna were used to detach Flanders from France. The story of this change in Flanders is closely intertwined with English history.

Mary of Burgundy died in 1482 leaving Maximilian a widower with two children, Philip and Margaret. Just before his death, in 1483, Louis XI. signed the Peace of Arras and betrothed the Dauphin, soon to be Charles VIII., to the baby princess, Margaret, of Flanders, who was kept at Paris until she should arrive at a marriageable age. Confusion reigned in the Low Countries after Mary's death. The chief interest of the French fief, Flanders, was weaving, and

English cloth was prohibited in Flanders. The merchants of Bruges watched with anger the passing of their prosperity to Antwerp, which imported English cloth for Brabant and the other provinces. There was economic division in Brabant, as well as in Flanders, since Brabantine weavers were also being ruined by English cloth; but, on the whole, Flanders was in favour of protection and the German fiefs of free trade.

The Flemish obtained possession of the child duke, Philip, and refused to allow his German father, Maximilian, any voice in their government. With Margaret at Paris and Philip in Flanders, with England weakened by a King, Richard III., whose vices had disgusted his people, and with the economic interests of the Flemish forcing them towards France, the political union of Flanders and France would probably have been accomplished but for two reasons. The annexation of Flanders would almost certainly have caused war between France and Maximilian's father, the Emperor of Germany, and the prospect of annexing Brittany to France diverted the interest of the French from Flanders. Hence when Henry VII. became King of England, Maximilian had, after a civil war, established his authority over the Low Countries, France was moving towards the final conquest of Brittany, and fate was preparing, for what is now called Belgium economic and political ruin. The short-lived prosperity of Brabant, which came from the free trade of Antwerp, was about to place the southern provinces of the Netherlands under Spanish rule and to make them for centuries a battlefield where European nations fought for any issue except the

freedom and independence of the unhappy land which was devastated in the wars.

During the early years of Henry's reign the ancient questions of Flanders and France dominated England's foreign policy. Spain was then preoccupied with the tasks of absorbing the Mahomedan kingdom of Granada and transforming herself into a great military and naval power. When Maximilian tried to prevent the absorption of Brittany by France, and to regain the Burgundian provinces which Louis XI. had annexed, he was constantly thwarted by his Flemish subjects. Maximilian's policy involved alliance with England and war with France; and, whilst this suited the interests of the merchants of Antwerp, it was fatal to the weaving industry of Flanders. Flanders was the scene of incessant civil wars, and the hatred of England which permeated the land found expression in the schemes of the Dowager Duchess Margaret, widow of Charles the Bold and sister of Edward IV.

Soon after Henry's accession an impostor, Lambert Simnel, personated the Earl of Warwick, a nephew of Edward IV., who was at the time closely imprisoned in the Tower. In Ireland Simnel was accepted as King, and Margaret of Burgundy sent Flemish soldiers to assist the rebels. But the movement failed in England, and without great difficulty Henry defeated the invading army of Irish and Flemings at Stoke-on-Trent in 1487. French designs against the autonomy of Brittany drew Maximilian and Henry together, and Ferdinand also nominally joined the alliance. The Spanish were anxious to recover two frontier provinces, Rousillon and Cerdagne, which Louis XI. had

managed to obtain ; but they were preoccupied by the war in Granada.

In 1489 Parliament made a grant for the war with France. This was followed by an insurrection in the North of England, a not uncommon sequel to an attempt at levying taxes in those days. When this revolt was suppressed, Henry had to help Maximilian in suppressing the Flemish, who had taken arms against the English alliance and the proposed war with France. Still pressed by the Flemish, Maximilian made peace with France in 1489, a few months after an English army had landed in Brittany. The chief result of England's invasion of Brittany was the marriage of the young Duchess of Brittany by proxy to Maximilian in 1490. The French at once invaded Brittany, and Maximilian's bride was then actually married to Charles VIII. in 1491. In this way Brittany was permanently joined to France, whose sea power was thus greatly increased.

Ferdinand, Henry, and Maximilian prepared for war with France. The usual rebellion in Flanders was suppressed by Maximilian's army, aided by an English fleet, and in 1492 Henry crossed to Calais and laid siege to Boulogne. Disunion in the Netherlands, however, wrecked the alliance. The Dowager Duchess had been secretly preparing a fresh impostor, Perkin Warbeck, who was supposed in Flanders to be an illegitimate son of Edward IV. by the wife of a Flemish boatman. In 1491 Warbeck assumed in Ireland the *rôle* of the younger of the princes who were murdered in the Tower.

Instead of vigorously attacking France, Spain

entered into negotiations for the restoration of the provinces she coveted, and Henry, threatened with revolt at home, wisely accepted a large indemnity from Charles and signed the peace of Etaples. A few months later Spain gained her provinces and also made peace, and soon after, in 1493, Maximilian, too, signed the treaty of Senlis. By this treaty Maximilian's daughter, Margaret, was returned to her father, and with her many of the Burgundian land annexed by Louis after the death of Charles the Bold were restored. Charles VIII. made these sacrifices in order to free himself for the conquest of Italy. This invasion seemed at first to be a triumphal progress rather than war. A rich prize was being fought for—the Italian monopoly of alum. Had France succeeded by stopping the supply of alum, she could, without war, have forced Flemish dressers and dyers to join the weavers in demanding the union of Flanders and France. Spanish influence over Southern Italy was disappearing when Louis' son, then Charles VIII. of France, was confronted by a Holy League—that is, one which included the Pope. The League was created by Ferdinand; Maximilian, Emperor of Germany since 1493, and Henry VII. joined it, and the French conquest of Italy was checked.

Warbeck, deprived of French aid by the peace of Etaples, went to Flanders, where the Dowager Duchess unofficially supplied him with men and ships. With these he tried and failed to land at Deal in 1495. Thence he again sailed to Ireland; but Henry had, during the previous year, sent Sir Edward Poynings to Ireland to prepare for Warbeck's return. It was

then that the Poynings Acts were passed by the Irish Parliament. These made existing English law valid in Ireland and decreed that in future all Irish legislation should be invalid unless approved by the English Council. After failing in Ireland, Warbeck found shelter in Scotland, where he was at first cordially received by James IV. After the formation of the Holy League, Warbeck was repudiated by his Flemish friends.

In 1496 Parliament made a large grant for war with James IV. of Scotland. Opposition to taxation led to an insurrection of the Cornish. This revolt, following the previous rising in Northumberland, appears to have been the reason why Henry summoned only one other Parliament during the remaining thirteen years of his reign, and from the Parliament of 1504 he only asked the customary feudal dues on knighting his eldest son and marrying his eldest daughter; but even these customary payments were strongly opposed. The Cornish rebels advanced unopposed through Southern England to suffer a crushing defeat at Blackheath. Warbeck had left Scotland in order to raise the Irish, but was forced to land in the West without followers. In spite of the battle of Blackheath, an insurgent army soon assembled. Without much difficulty, however, Warbeck was captured, and after escaping from the Tower he was executed in 1499. In the same month the Earl of Warwick suffered the same punishment.

The war with Scotland was not vigorously prosecuted, and a truce was signed in 1497. This truce became a defensive alliance in 1502, and the alliance was sealed by the marriage of James IV. to Henry's

elder daughter, Margaret. From this marriage came the union of Great Britain under James I. The alliance of Maximilian and Ferdinand was in like manner confirmed in 1496, when Ferdinand's daughter, Juanna, married Maximilian's son, Philip, and the Spanish fleet which carried Juanna to the Netherlands returned with Philip's sister, Margaret, who was married to Juan, the heir of Spain.

Whilst Flanders was supporting Warbeck, Anglo-Flemish trade, other than that carried on by the merchants of the Steelyard, was stopped. The anger of the Merchant Adventurers was expressed by an attack on the Steelyard. But, until England possessed a strong navy, the Hanse League was a dangerous foe, and the rioting was suppressed. To induce England to join the Holy League the Magnus Intercursus, an Anglo-Burgundian commercial treaty, was signed in 1496, and English merchants returned to Antwerp. Ten years later, when Philip and Juanna were sailing south to take possession of Castile, which they inherited on the death of Isabella, they were forced to seek refuge in England. From his guests Henry obtained two very advantageous treaties, one of which, the Malus Intercursus, deprived Flemish weavers of the limited protection afforded them by the Magnus Intercursus. A storm of protest in Flanders sealed the fate of the new commercial treaty, and trade was conducted on the lines laid down in Magnus Intercursus.

" Their first contact with the West Indies revealed to the Spaniards the possibility of opening up fresh sources of supply, and the amount of the precious

metals they acquired was quite unprecedented. The islands supplied annually increasing quantities till 1516; in 1522 the exploitation of Mexico began." Dr. Cunningham adds that, measured by the value of grain, the rise in prices was as 1 to 2·40 from 1540 to 1582, and as 1 to 2·22 from 1583 to 1642. In one century, therefore, the cost of grain food increased more than fivefold. As this wealth belonged to Spain, her sudden appearance as the greatest Power in Europe is easily accounted for. She had the means of increasing her navy to an almost unlimited extent. The people of Spain were trained to arms owing to their frequent contests with the Mahomedans; her rulers had the wealth to support armies on foreign service. From the beginning of the sixteenth century until 1648, Spanish infantry enjoyed the reputation of being invincible; but ultimately Spain's fiscal system ruined her army. The Spanish soldier was conquered by the rise in prices.

Spain's fatal mistake was the undervaluing of Spanish production. Before the days of Ferdinand and Isabella, manufactures were largely in the hands of Moors, who were also better agriculturists than their Christian neighbours. Commerce was conducted by Jews, who for centuries enjoyed more toleration in Spain than in other parts of Europe. Suddenly toleration was replaced by persecution. The Jews were banished in 1492, and the Moors shared their fate when gold from America promised to give Spain wealth which was not earned by work done in the home country. A century later, when Spain was intoxicated by unearned gold, the Christianised Moors,

or Moriscos, were also expelled. In defiance of the laws of Spain the precious metals were exported to buy foreign products, and this exportation increased as prices rose. When Spain's ability to pay for an army and navy declined, her military and naval strength naturally decayed.

The rise in prices was of benefit to England. Her products increased in value as Spanish gold and silver lost their purchasing power. But England's Kings suffered. The rooted objection of the English to all taxation increased when ever-increasing sums of money had to be raised for national purposes. The dissolution of the monasteries and the execution of Charles I. were both largely due to the need of additional supply for national purposes when the value of the precious metals declined. It was a mere chance that Columbus did not discover America for England instead of for Spain. Cabot, almost immediately after the voyage of Columbus, sailed from Bristol to Newfoundland. But until 1525 England feared to challenge Spain's monopoly of the New World. Then the economic strength which came from English production enabled England to begin a contest that lasted until Spain was ruined. Spain bought goods from all nations, England sold goods to all; hence Spain became a sieve through which the precious metals flowed to England.

Henry VII. appears to have foreseen the impending change. He could not increase taxation without the danger of rebellions; but from the rich, by fines and benevolences, he obtained such wealth that his son, Henry VIII., is reported to have inherited 1,800,000*l.*

with the Crown of England. Of England at this time Bacon wrote : " The Crown extremely rich and full of treasure, and the kingdom like to be so in a short time. For there was no war, no dearth, no stop of trade or commerce ; it was only the Crown which sucked too hard ; but now being full, and upon the head of a young King, it was like to draw the less." The seventeen-year-old King at once ceased to suck money. Victims were invited to lay their grievances before the King ; and the agents of Henry VII., Dudley and Empson, were executed.

The Anglo-Spanish *entente cordiale* brought prosperity. France paid large annual sums to safeguard her coasts from English invaders. Without aid from France the Scotch did not dare to attack England. The middlemen of Spain were ready to buy English cloth, at Antwerp or Cadiz, which they could sell in their home and colonial markets. Portugal, with her markets in the East, the Netherlands, Italy, and Germany, was being rapidly brought under Spanish influence. Access to Italian alum, a vital necessity for the development of dressing and dyeing in England, was open as long as England and Spain were at peace. Protection of industry was welding England into a united nation. The centralising power of the Crown was destroying the decentralisation which prevailed when feudal magnates were semi-independent kinglets. On the Continent a movement was in progress towards the creation of an Empire out of the States of Europe. Charles of Burgundy was about to become Duke of Austria, King of Spain, and the great Emperor Charles V. of Germany. Whilst England was laying

the foundations of what has become a world-wide Empire on the sure rock of the protection of national production, Charles V. was destined to prove the impossibility of building on the sandy foundation of international trade and the exploitation of recently discovered lands. Before Charles abdicated in 1555, crushed by the task he had undertaken, it had been clearly demonstrated that a nation united by protecting its workers was stronger than the most powerful and wealthy monarch of an empire of traders.

The policy of France resembled that of England, and she, like England, resisted absorption into the European federation. Her Kings, in alliance with the artisans of her towns, had created out of semi-independent provinces a nation whose area was nearly as great as that of modern France. Mediæval commerce could not exist without commercial treaties, and the long Anglo-French wars made such treaties impossible except for brief periods. In the "Libel of English Policie," England's trade with Flanders and Brittany is mentioned; but this existed because these provinces were semi-independent. Nothing is said of direct Anglo-French commerce, because it was practically non-existent. It is easy to understand why England often fought to maintain the autonomy of the French provinces and why she allied herself with Spain when the French tried to absorb Italy and the Italian alum mines. Had the French become masters of Italy, the dressers and dyers of Flanders, to whom alum was indispensable, must have starved like their brother weavers or become a part of France. The

French, doubtless, realised that they could conquer Flanders in Italy.

Charles VIII. of France was followed by Louis XII. in 1498. The new King of France continued the policy of bribing the English to abstain from attacking France, in order that the French might concentrate their energies on the invasion of Italy; but the Italians, aided by the Spaniards, were able to keep the French at bay. A year before Henry VII. died, the Pope, Spain, and France forgot for a time that they were foes and joined in the League of Cambrai. The object of this League was to plunder Venice, and it was speedily gained. When the Pope and the Spaniards had obtained their desires, and the French were making use of the alliance to establish themselves in Northern Italy, a new Holy League was formed between the Pope, Spain, and Venice in order to resist Louis XII. Thus Henry VIII., at his accession, was confronted, as his father had been, with the danger to the rapidly growing woollen industry of England which was involved in the establishment of French control over the alum mines of Italy.

## XVII

### SUPPRESSION OF THE MONASTERIES

1509–1539

HENRY VIII. began his reign by an act which endeared him to his magnates. Dudley and Empson, the agents who had been employed by his father to fleece the rich, were executed. The extortion of money ceased, and Parliaments were summoned. The King married his sister-in-law, Catherine of Aragon; and joined the Holy League in 1511. An English fleet sailed to Guienne, but Ferdinand once again used the Anglo-Spanish alliance to further the interests of Spain, whilst England gained nothing. As Rousillon and Cerdagne had been added to Ferdinand's dominions when Henry VII. was Spain's ally, so now the Spanish won Navarre, but the English failed to establish themselves in Guienne. The French invasion of Italy was, however, wrecked by this counter-attack.

English politicians were looking forward to the future when Ferdinand's death would place his grandson Charles on the Spanish throne. In 1508 Mary, the sister of Henry VIII., had been married by proxy to Charles, and the scene of the Anglo-French war was shifted to the North of France. Here the English met with more success. In alliance with Charles' German

grandfather, Maximilian, Henry VIII. was able to make himself master of the rich and populous city of Tournay after winning the Battle of the Spurs in August 1513. Meanwhile, the Scotch had followed their ancient custom of allying themselves with France against England, but Scotland's army was destroyed, and her king, James IV., killed at Flodden Field in September 1513.

After the Battle of the Spurs, Louis XII. of France abandoned the fight for Italy. Ferdinand was expressing his anxiety to marry his grandson, Charles, to one of Louis' daughters when Henry made peace with France. Tournay was left in England's keeping and a large French annuity was promised to the King of England. Mary, in spite of her marriage by proxy to Charles, was actually married to Louis XII., only to become a widow within a few months, when in 1515 Louis died and his cousin became Francis I. of France. Mary then married the Duke of Suffolk without her brother's consent. The unfortunate Lady Jane Grey was Mary's grandchild.

After Flodden, Scotland was governed by Henry's sister, Margaret, as Regent for her infant son, James V. He, as the only living grandchild of Henry VII., might at any moment have become King of England as well as King of Scotland. This is enough to account for the fact that Flodden Field was not followed by an invasion of Scotland. The Saxons of Great Britain were drawing closer to each other. The nobles of Scotland, who had still the semi-independent power which their English brethren had lost during the Wars of the Roses, were naturally averse to the union; but

a strong body of opinion in England and in Scotland was in its favour, and time was on the side of the unionists. When English magnates told Henry VII. that the marriage of his daughter, Margaret, might place England under a Scotch King, he laughed at their fears, telling them that "the greater would draw the less." This was, however, but a half-truth; in a perfect union there is neither greater nor less. If the union of England and Scotland proves that this is true, the union of Great Britain and Ireland also proves that a union is not perfect if the economic bond is absent.

The Anglo-French peace enabled the French to win the victory of Marignano in 1515 and become masters of Northern Italy. The army of a Holy League, which did not include England, was defeated, and the Medicean Pope, Leo X., allied himself with Francis I. In 1516 Ferdinand died, and Charles of Burgundy, at the age of sixteen, became Charles I. of Spain. When Charles took possession of his kingdom he was followed by Flemings and other foreigners who were anxious to do the work which had formerly been done by the Moors and Jews. But hatred of the foreigner and contempt for home production were deeply engrained in the Spaniards. Their communes rose in revolt, and, though the insurgents were defeated, their policy was adopted. The development of Spain's industry was checked. She became a military parasitic power. With her industry her ancient liberty also passed away. Her ruler is known as the Emperor Charles V., not as King Charles I. of Spain. Three years after Ferdinand's death Charles inherited the

German and Austrian lands of his other grandfather, the Emperor Maximilian, thus becoming the greatest European monarch since the days of Charles the Great.

Meanwhile Cardinal Wolsey, who was directing the policy of England, found in the alliance of Francis I. and the Pope, which followed Marignano, a problem hard for an English Cardinal to solve. He maintained nominal peace with France, whilst he sent subsidies to enable Maximilian to resist Francis I. and tried to form a new Holy League by detaching Leo X. from the French alliance. Wolsey's plans were shattered when Ferdinand died. Charles was by birth and education a Fleming, and the policy of Flanders at this time has been described by Machiavelli. "The people of Flanders live generally of their own manufactures, which they vend at the fairs in France—that is, at Paris and Lyons—for towards the seaside they have no utterance, and towards Germany it is the same, for there are more of their commodities made than in Flanders, so that whenever their commerce with the French is cut off they will have nowhere to put off their commodities, nor nowhere to supply themselves with victuals. So that, without irresistible necessity, the Flemings will never have any controversy with France."

Antwerp was enjoying the short-lived prosperity of a trading town whose commerce is not founded on home production; whilst the producers of Flanders were clinging desperately to France, the one market in which they were to some extent secure. From their native land, which Antwerp's free importation was ruining, the Flemish fled to protected England in such numbers that, in 1517, on Evil May Day there

were riots in London in which alien workmen were killed. These riots were suppressed, and when order was enforced Parliament passed measures to redress the grievance. Wiser than the Spanish, the English continued to welcome aliens who could teach new crafts, but the number of foreign journeymen who could be employed was limited that Englishmen might have work. The foreign craftsmen had to take English apprentices that Englishmen might become independent of foreign instructors. This carefully planned State aid enabled England to improve her woollen industry.

Six months after his accession to the throne of Spain Charles signed the peace of Noyou with Francis I., confirming the peace by a promise to marry the French King's daughter. After his grandson's defection Maximilian still took English gold, but as he failed to do the promised fighting, in 1518 an Anglo-French treaty was signed. England again received large sums of money from France; Henry's infant daughter Mary was betrothed to the Dauphin, and Tournay was restored to France. Northern Italy was left under French control, whilst the Spanish were masters in the south. Between these rival powers the Pope and his allies, the Medici of Florence, ruled over buffer States, which contained the highly prized mines of alum. England now sought to solve the Italian problem by placing an Englishman, Cardinal Wolsey, on the papal throne. Had she been able to control the supply of alum the development of her woollen industry would have secured her from any injury from the rise in prices. Whilst European affairs were

in this state of suspense, Maximilian's death in 1519 necessitated the election of another emperor. The chief candidates were Francis and Charles, though Henry VIII. and Charles' only brother, Ferdinand, were also mentioned.

The weavers and peasants of Germany were beginning to suffer from the importation of cheap corn and cheap cloth; whilst German middlemen, Fuggers and Welsers, were growing enormously rich. Germans, like other North Europeans, were cut off from direct communication with the outside world by the Spanish and Portuguese monopolies, which had papal sanction. German exports and imports had to pay toll in Spain on their journeys to and from America, and sea power was clearly destined to pass from the Hanseatic League to those great ships which Spain could build for her lucrative American trade. Capitalist Fuggers were not so adversely affected by Spain's monopoly of American trade. Their capital was free from restrictions, and it was invested in mining ventures in the New World as well as in Antwerp. It was the gold of the Fuggers which secured the election of the Emperor Charles V.

Charles' election was aided by the prevalent idea that he would foster German industry and create, from the disunited German States, a nation like that which had recently been formed from the semi-independent provinces of France. For as yet Charles had shown sympathy for Flanders rather than Spain, and he had tried to protect Flemish industry. The Nationalists of Germany saw, from the first, that Germany could not be unified without a religious change. From all

Christendom Rome drew tribute. When the Pope allied himself with the French, he became a possible enemy of Germany and England; yet the tribute had still to be paid. Moreover in Germany the power of prince-bishops had to be curbed; but this was impossible until Rome's central authority was undermined. The Bishop of Durham was the only prelate who had semi-independent jurisdiction in England; but English bishops had their own courts and special privileges which at times conflicted with the authority of the English King. The English navy was being created by Henry VIII. It was easy to see that if England became a sea power, she too would come into conflict with Spain.

One important source of papal revenue was the sale of indulgences, documents which professed to give the purchaser pardon for sin. The Fuggers had gained much wealth from their commission on the sale of indulgences. In 1513 a Dominican monk, Tetzel, was selling an indulgence granting absolution for all sins except offences against ecclesiastics, selling arms or forbidden goods to the infidel, and importing alum from the Turk instead of from the papal mines, contrary to the apostolic prohibition. Tetzel was forbidden to enter Saxony, but he came close to the frontier, and the good folk of Wittenberg went out to buy. A recently appointed theological professor, Dr. Martin Luther, challenged a discussion on the sale of indulgences, and in accordance with custom nailed the theses, or points to be discussed, on the door of the Castle Church. All was ready for the explosion when this match was applied. The university press could not cope with the

demand for the German translation of the theses. It was the beginning of the Reformation.

Other reformers had died in the fire, but Luther found himself the spokesman of the German Nationalist party, which was looking forward to a certain and rapid victory when Charles was elected. The policy of this party is clearly stated in Luther's writings. Separation from Rome was advocated, not only because the Popes taught false doctrines, but because a free and united Germany was impossible as long as the country was impoverished by tribute paid to Rome. It was also clearly recognised that another cause of Germany's weakness was the free importation of the Fuggers and their fellows, which was making the German worker poorer whilst it enriched the middleman. As a concession to the Nationalists a Reichsregiment, or national council, was established, but in this body neither the cities nor the small landowners were represented, and its power was strictly circumscribed.

Nevertheless, at the first meeting of the council, a scheme was passed which would have given the Netherlands and Germany fiscal unity by encircling them with custom houses. This measure was vetoed by Charles at the request of the Fuggers and other German merchants. Whilst this measure of fiscal reform was being vetoed, the small landowners had risen in revolt. When this rising was suppressed, a wave of Socialism spread over Germany, and the Peasants' War began. Until Charles abdicated in 1555, Germany was the scene of incessant disorder. Then there was a pause whilst both sides marshalled their forces. In 1619 the last act in the long struggle commenced. During the

Thirty Years' War Germany suffered indescribable horrors, and when peace was signed at Westphalia, two-thirds of her population had disappeared. What was once the greatest empire in Europe became a collection of disunited States, doomed to be weak until the nineteenth century, when a Zollverein recreated the German Empire.

After the election of Charles V., England for a time pursued an undecided policy. Henry and Francis swore eternal friendship at the Field of the Cloth of Gold in 1520. This was immediately followed by a secret agreement between Henry and Charles. The project of marrying Henry's daughter to Charles was discussed, and Charles promised Wolsey the tiara at the first vacancy. Although this promise was broken and Charles' former tutor, a Fleming, became Pope Adrian VI. in 1522, England declared war against France, when the French made a new move in their plans for the conquest of Italy. Mary was then formally betrothed to Charles, and Charles again promised to secure Wolsey's election as Pope when a vacancy occurred. The English raids in France were of little importance, but France was crushed at the battle of Pavia in 1525, and Francis became Charles' prisoner. Meanwhile Pope Adrian died in 1523, but instead of Wolsey, one of the Medici became Pope Clement VII.

Want of money prevented Charles from following up the victory of Pavia. England made peace with France, after receiving a large indemnity, and in 1526 Francis bought his freedom by surrendering lands in Burgundy to his captor and agreeing to abandon all

designs on Italy. Spain loomed so large that it seemed as if the Empire she was creating would enfold the young nations of Europe in a deadly embrace. Her economic weakness was concealed by her military and naval strength. The Spanish had been forced into rebellion before Charles decreed that foreign cloth should be subject to the same tests as Spanish cloth. In 1526 the Emperor signed a treaty with France which sanctioned the importation of French cloth, whilst Spanish cloth was prohibited in France. From so invertebrate a power England had in reality little to fear. Time would ruin her more effectually than war. On the other hand, France was a dangerous economic rival. This appears to have been the view taken by Wolsey, who leaned towards war with France. Others, however, were of opinion that war with France would weaken England and render her an easy prey for the Spaniard. This opinion was shared by Wolsey's dependent, Thomas Cromwell, who before long supplanted his master.

After Pavia there was an Anglo-French alliance, and men waited to see whether Pope Clement could resist the Emperor Charles. To encourage the Pope, 30,000 ducats were sent from England to Rome in return for rights over the alum mines, from which Henry said that he expected "high pleasure and profit." All these fond anticipations vanished when Charles' army stormed and sacked Rome in 1527. This punishment was inflicted because Pope Clement had failed in subservience to his patron Charles. After so severe a lesson there was little chance that the Pope would repeat his mistake. Rome and the Church

had apparently been absorbed in Charles' Empire, and Henry's life seemed all that protected England from Rome's fate. If the young princess Mary had become Queen, her Spanish mother would have been England's ruler; under their guidance England might have become a province of Charles' Empire.

The right of a woman to succeed to the throne of England was by no means certain. Mary's cousin, James V. of Scotland, would probably have contested her claim. James could have counted on help from France, whilst Mary would have been supported by Spain. Unless Henry left a male heir civil war in England seemed inevitable after his death, and it was well known that Queen Catherine could no longer bear children. It was therefore decided that the King should obtain a divorce from Catherine on the ground of her having been his brother's wife; and Henry chose Anne Boleyn as his future wife. The need of an English heir to the throne of England was so urged that, in normal times, Henry's request would probably have been granted; but Spain's influence at Rome was too powerful, and the divorce of Queen Catherine developed into a struggle during which the English learned that their nationality was in danger unless they severed themselves from Rome.

For six years Henry's divorce suit was argued at Rome, where men who had lived under the Borgias must have wondered why Catherine and her daughter were not quietly poisoned. It is absurd to suppose that sensual passion prompted Henry to persevere with his suit. After 1527 he lived openly with Anne Boleyn, and he could only have sought to give England

a lawful king if his union with Anne proved fruitful. England and France formed a close alliance and declared war against the Emperor in 1528; but in the following year Francis abandoned the contest as hopeless. All hope of freeing the papacy from Charles' control passed away, and Wolsey, who had staked his future on obtaining the divorce without breaking with Rome, died a ruined man in 1530. His dependent, Thomas Cromwell, became at first the secret and then the open adviser of the King. Cranmer, a priest who had embraced Luther's doctrines and was secretly married, aided Cromwell in arranging Henry's divorce and England's breach with Rome. Cranmer was made Archbishop of Canterbury in 1532. Cromwell and Cranmer had little difficulty in obtaining the consent of Parliament to the breach with Rome, which put an end to the payments made by England to the papacy. In January 1533 Henry, hoping that Anne was about to present him with the longed-for heir, privately married her. Archbishop Cranmer lost no time in proclaiming Henry's divorce from Catherine and the validity of his marriage to Anne, whose daughter Elizabeth was born in September 1533. There was great fear in England of a Spanish invasion, and severe measures were taken against those who denied the King's supremacy over the English Church. The two most conspicuous martyrs were Cardinal Fisher and Sir Thomas More. In January 1536 Catherine of Aragon died and fear of invasion passed away.

Within a few months of Catherine's death, Anne Boleyn was accused of having committed adultery with four men, one of whom was her own brother. More

than seventy English noblemen and gentlemen, including Anne's father, uncle, and her former lover, were unanimous in returning verdicts of guilty after they had heard the evidence against the Queen and those who were accused with her. All the accused were executed, and Henry at once married another English wife, Jane Seymour, who died in October 1537 after giving birth to a son, the future Edward VI. Whilst Henry's bureaucratic government did not hesitate to strike at men as eminent and virtuous as Sir Thomas More, it was keenly alive to the danger of offending the mass of the people of England. Increased taxation, which otherwise would have followed the rise in prices, was avoided by granting to the King the dues which had been paid to the Pope. The monasteries, deprived of all support from Rome, were suppressed and plundered. Some of the plunder found its way into the pockets of the magnates, but the bulk of it was placed in the royal treasury.

The English Reformation was at first economic rather than religious. The English people had little sympathy with Luther's doctrines and Henry shared their views. In 1523 the Pope bestowed on him the title Defender of the Faith as a reward for his having written against Luther, in which he eloquently described a husband's duty to his wife. England's needs made him a reformer whose conduct as a husband has been sharply criticised. The English, alarmed perhaps by the socialist excesses which accompanied the Reformation in Germany, wished to retain the ancient creed, and Henry gave them what they wished. The suppression of the monasteries led to insurrec-

tions, such as the Pilgrimage of Grace in Yorkshire; but these had little chance of success without foreign aid. During one of the most critical periods in England's history Spain was the foe England chiefly dreaded, and troubles in Germany, fear of a Turkish invasion, and the hostility of France kept Charles too fully occupied to interfere in English affairs. In 1539, however, it seemed as if Charles and Francis had forgotten their differences and could unite to restore Rome's authority in England. The danger was so great that it affords at least some excuse for the measures that were taken to avert it.

# XVIII

## ENGLAND FREES HERSELF FROM PAPAL SUPREMACY

### 1539–1559

ENGLAND was fortifying her coasts in 1539 to be ready for the threatened invasion. Charles and Francis had signed a truce for ten years in June 1538, and as a preliminary to a direct attack arrangements were being made to close the markets of the Continent to English goods. The French were willing to break off all commercial intercourse with England if Charles would close the ports of his Empire. A great stimulus would have been given to the production of France by the destruction of English industry. But Charles' Empire depended on international trade. In 1528 the merchants of the Empire had taught their Emperor that he must not interfere with their trade. It was their opposition which forced Charles to acquiesce sullenly in the divorce of Catherine of Aragon. The Emperor was unable to agree to commercial war, and before plans for a direct attack on England were made, in 1539 Charles was compelled to devote his energies to crushing a rebellion of the burghers of Ghent. England's danger passed away when, in 1540, it became evident that the war between Francis and Charles would soon begin afresh.

Dreading the coming of an invader the English took steps to secure unity within the island. Any change in religious thought and practice could not fail to divide the English. Parliament, therefore, in 1539 passed the Act of the Six Articles, which punished with the stake or the gallows those who denied the ancient Catholic faith. Thus it happened that in England a man risked his life if he acknowledged the Pope's authority, or if he denied the creed of Rome. Though Luther's doctrines were banned in England, Henry in January 1540 married Anne of Cleves to make sure of the support of the Protestants of Germany in the event of war with Francis and Charles. Six months later, when fear of invasion was passing away, this marriage was dissolved with the consent of both husband and wife. It was probably only a nominal marriage, as Henry conceived an aversion to his bride at their first meeting. Cromwell's policy of friendship with France and hostility to the Emperor had obviously failed when Charles, Francis, and the Pope were forming schemes for the destruction of England. He paid for his mistake with his head in 1540; and Henry personally ruled over England until his death in 1547.

In 1528, when war with Spain was only averted by the pressure which merchants in England and the Netherlands brought to bear upon their rulers, the Spanish began their policy of exciting rebellion in Ireland, using that island as the French had used Scotland. Henry met this attack by winning over the Irish chieftains with grants of monastic lands, so that English rule seemed to be more firmly established than it had been. But, whereas in England some-

thing was ultimately done to compensate the poor for the loss of the alms they had received from the monks, in Ireland nothing was done. No schools were founded, and there was no Irish poor law until the nineteenth century, when it was introduced in spite of the opposition of Cobden and the free-trade economists. In 1504 the fatal policy of treating Ireland economically as a foreign country was inaugurated, when the exportation of English money to Ireland and the importation of Irish money were prohibited. Great Britain, as well as Ireland, has paid for these mistakes. On the other hand, Wales was made one with England in 1536, when it was arranged that Welsh members should be summoned to Parliament, and Henry devoted the last years of his life to the promotion of the union of England and Scotland.

Although in 1525 Queen Margaret could describe the people of Scotland as " more inclined to England than to France," the opposition of Scotch magnates wrecked Henry's plan of uniting Great Britain by marrying his daughter and heiress, Mary, to her cousin James V. The movement in favour of union, however, gained ground in Scotland amongst the laity. Henry's agent in Edinburgh reported, in 1543, that the " nobles and the whole temporality " favoured the proposed marriage of Henry's heir, Edward, to Mary, the infant heiress of Scotland, but that " undoubtedlie the kyrkemen labor, by all the meanes they can, to empeche the unitie and establishment of these twoo realmes." It was these churchmen who, under Cardinal Beaton, kept Scotland loyal to Rome when England broke with the papacy. They feared the

loss of their possessions if the union of Great Britain was accomplished, and they influenced James V. in his choice of a wife. In 1537 the Scotch King married the daughter of Francis I., and when she died his second wife was Mary of Guise.

When Francis and Charles were planning the destruction of England in 1539 they could confidently count upon Scotland's aid. Whilst Henry bribed the merchants of the Netherlands to oppose war with England by proclaiming that for seven years they could import English cloth on paying the same duties as English merchants paid, he used every effort to detach James V. from France. In vain Henry asked James to meet him in 1536 and in 1542. The short-lived friendship between France and Spain came to an end in 1541; hence, when James refused the second invitation to a friendly alliance, Henry resorted to force. James V. died in 1542 after the defeat of his army at Solway Moss, learning on his deathbed that Mary of Guise had given birth to an heiress to the throne of Scotland, the unfortunate Mary Stewart. The splendid opportunity of uniting Great Britain by the marriage of Prince Edward and Queen Mary was lost through the opposition of Cardinal Beaton. In 1546 the Cardinal paid with his life for his devotion to his Church, when he was murdered by the unionists of Scotland who were already looking upon the heretic preacher, John Knox, as their leader.

One of Henry's greatest achievements was the creation of a strong navy. When in 1544 France and Scotland were at war with England and Charles' Empire, the Scotch fleet was utterly destroyed,

Boulogne was captured by the English, and a French attack in the Solent ended in failure. In 1546, a week after Cardinal Beaton's death, peace was signed. The French paid a large indemnity and promised a still larger sum in eight years' time, when Boulogne was to be restored to France. Scotland was wisely left to learn, under the regency of Mary of Guise, that her true policy was union with her kinsfolk in England. Mary taught the Scotch that she and her supporters were preparing the way for French rule whilst they posed as champions of the independence of Scotland.

Henry's health had been failing for many years. It is more than probable that his marriage with Catherine Howard in 1540 and with Catherine Parr in 1543 were as nominal as his union with Anne of Cleves. He had no children by these wives. Catherine Howard was Anne Boleyn's cousin ; and she, too, was convicted of adultery and executed in 1542. No doubt has been cast upon the justice of this conviction. Froude's conjectural explanation of Henry's matrimonial misfortunes is much more than plausible, though it throws doubt on the paternity certainly of Edward VI. and probably of Elizabeth. A confidential despatch of the Spanish Ambassador to England supports this doubt in the case of Edward VI. In spite of the wealth which Henry had acquired from the monasteries and the Church, he was compelled to debase the coinage in 1544, and when he died in 1547 his nine-year-old son succeeded to financial difficulties which tended to increase with the rise in prices.

On Edward's accession to the throne, one of his maternal uncles, Edward Seymour, became Regent.

He was given the title of Lord Protector, and was advanced to the dukedom of Somerset. The virtue and the vice of his rule was pithily expressed in a letter written by a friend to the Protector: "What seeth your Grace? Marry, the King's subjects all out of discipline, out of obedience, carrying neither for Protector nor King. What is the matter? Marry, sir, that which I said to your Grace in the gallery. Liberty! Liberty! and your Grace's too much gentleness, your softness, your opinion to be good to the poor—the opinion of such as saith to your Grace, 'Oh, sir, there was never man that had the hearts of the poor as you have.'" This reaction against Henry's iron rule lasted less than three years. These years were filled with risings in England and wars with France and Scotland. In them the currency was still further debased, foreigners poured into the country with their fatal poison, the strife of creeds, and Somerset was forced to acquiesce in the execution of his brother for treason. Like Stephen, the Protector "was a mild man, and soft, and good, and did no justice." He paid with his head for the anarchy.

Theoretically the Protector's schemes were admirable. He wished for a Great Britain united under Edward and Mary of Scotland; but, when he began to do the wooing for his nephew, it had to be done with that English army which won the battle of Pinkie in 1547. A French army came to Scotland's aid and carried off the young Queen to France. The war with France was not a success. By the peace of 1550 Boulogne was surrendered four years before the appointed time, for half the promised payment. The

laws which defined treason were rescinded and the power of the Crown reduced, whilst the Protector's brother, Admiral Lord Seymour, was preparing to play the part of Richard III. Three months after her husband's death Catherine Parr, the Queen Dowager, married Lord Seymour. Elizabeth was at the time living with Catherine Parr; and the Burleigh papers record a series of incidents, discreditable to both Catherine Parr and her husband, by which a girl of fourteen was brought under the control of Lord Seymour. The Queen Dowager died in child-bed little more than a year after her marriage, and Lord Seymour renewed his disgraceful intrigues with Elizabeth. The Admiral also organised a pirate fleet in the Channel and acquired strongholds which he filled with ammunition. The Protector signed his brother's death-warrant in 1549.

Henry's Act of the Six Articles, which punished those who abandoned the old faith, was repealed and foreigners were welcomed in England. These brought with them their industrial skill and the woollen manufacture was stimulated. With them also came religious discord and the Scotch firebrand, John Knox, embittered by nine months' toil at the oar of a French galley. Knox was welcomed in England, and might have been Bishop of Rochester but for his conscientious scruples. To obtain money the English government confiscated parochial endowments and the coinage was further debased. Common lands were enclosed with scant regard for the rights of the peasants. The rise in the price of wool, owing to the increase in England's cloth-making industry, tempted those who

obtained the common lands to turn them into sheep farms on which little labour was employed. Ruined monks and peasants took arms, hoping to check enclosures and restore the old faith. Ten thousand peasants were killed before these revolts were suppressed. Over large areas in England the country folk became landless men. Ultimately the poor found employment in the new English industries, but it was a different sowing of dragon's teeth to that sowed by Henry VII. In the weaving towns of the Eastern Counties Englishmen readily accepted from their Flemish teachers the doctrine that centralised government was bad and, a century after the enclosures, the Independents and Levellers wreaked their vengeance on an innocent King. They failed, however, to regain their land. Shortly before the French Reign of Terror, Arthur Young noticed with surprise that the number of peasant proprietors was far greater in France than in England.

The rebels complained that pasturage was replacing tillage, thus lessening the demand for labour. The enclosed wastes were converted into sheep farms and the land used for sheep increased; but there is little evidence that there was less land under corn. The statute of 1463 and the subsequent quarrel with the Baltic towns of the Hanse League so stimulated corn-growing in England that, as a rule, English corn was too cheap for the importation of foreign grain to be profitable. During the sixteenth century the price of corn did not advance as rapidly as the price of other commodities. Corn is not mentioned in a long list of necessary and unnecessary imports from the Low

Countries and France, drawn up about the year 1563. But perhaps the most striking proof of England's self-sufficiency in corn production is the blow struck at the Easterlings by Edward's government. As England's trade with the Baltic was in its infancy and the Hanse League were the chief carriers of cheap Polish corn, an attack on their privileges would have been impossible if England had been dependent on the foreigner for her food-supply. In 1552 the merchants of the Steelyard lost their privileges because the League had not fulfilled its promise to grant English merchants the same privileges in German towns as Germans enjoyed in England.

Somerset's sympathies were with the peasants in their opposition to the enclosures. At their own expense the magnates hired foreign troops to crush the revolt. Hence, when the peasants were defeated, Somerset fell as well as Ket and other peasant leaders. In 1549 the magnates under Warwick, soon to be Duke of Northumberland, drove Somerset from his Protectorship and paid themselves out of the public purse for the expenses they had incurred in defeating the peasants. In 1552 Somerset was executed and Northumberland governed England whilst Edward was dying of consumption. Before Edward's death in 1553 a royal will was signed bequeathing the Crown to Northumberland's daughter-in-law, Lady Jane Grey.

The doctrinal reformers included eminent ecclesiastics, such as Archbishop Cranmer; magnates who had grown rich from confiscated Church lands; and foreign artisans who had been pouring into England.

The majority of the English were still attached to the faith of their fathers. The death of Edward gave them their opportunity of avenging themselves on the lords who had hired foreigners to defeat English peasants. Northumberland won no support when he proclaimed his daughter-in-law Queen of England. The people were weary of a Reformation which they associated with bad money and enclosures. Mary became Queen and Northumberland followed Somerset to the block. The alien preachers were driven from England. Knox fled with them, returning to Scotland in 1555 to organise her breach with Rome in 1560.

During Mary's reign the other Mary of Scotland lived in France, waiting for her marriage in 1558 and for her few months' reign with her husband, Francis II., over both France and Scotland. When the Marys were Queens, in Great Britain the unionist cause appeared to be losing ground; but, beneath the surface, Scotch and English were both learning the lesson, which they have never forgotten, that disunion in Great Britain means foreign rule in the island. In 1554 Mary of England married Philip, the heir to the dominions of Charles V. The Spaniards were as little liked in England as the French were in Scotland. Though elaborate precautions were taken in the marriage treaty to safeguard the independence of England, a revolt, headed by Wyatt, had to be suppressed in 1554, and a less serious rising in 1557. With the Spaniards came religious persecution. Had the fires of Smithfield been lighted only for the rich the reaction against the corruption of the magnates during Edward's minority might have outlasted Mary's

reign. But those who died were mostly poor folk who had nothing to do with the enclosures.

After his marriage Philip waited in England for a son who failed to appear. Elizabeth's fate trembled in the balance. Had there been an heir she would have been the one thing not wanted ; but, if there were no children from the Spanish marriage, either Elizabeth or the Frenchwoman, Mary of Scotland, would rule over England. To the Spaniard, Elizabeth was better than the Frenchwoman. Heir or no heir, it is probable that England would have emancipated herself from the grip of the cosmopolitan Emperor, Charles V. ; but it would have been at a terrible cost had Mary given birth to a son. Worn out by the impossible task of ruling over a cosmopolitan empire, Charles abdicated in 1555, and Philip went to Flanders to be invested with the government of the Netherlands. Ferdinand, the brother of Charles V., became Emperor of Germany and Duke of Austria, whilst Philip II. succeeded to the Low Countries, Spain, and Spanish Italy.

When Elizabeth was released and recognised as heiress apparent, the more far-seeing may have associated with Elizabeth, in their forecast of a happy England under another Queen, a certain William Cecil, who was Elizabeth's friend and adviser. To Cecil was due the credit of depriving the Germans of their privileges in the reign of Edward VI. Under Mary, Cecil was neglected, and the Hanseatic merchants recovered their old privileges when she came to the throne ; but they enjoyed their liberty for less than two years. The Queen, who dared to re-establish the Pope's supremacy and to burn Archbishop Cranmer

and other English bishops, was forced in 1555 to yield to the demands of the merchants of London. Even the prayer of a husband whom the Queen passionately loved was without effect. The Germans were deprived of their right to monopolise the commerce of England. In their anger they placed England under a commercial interdict, which lasted until Mary's death in 1558.

In 1557 the Spanish alliance involved England in war with France. Before Mary's death, Calais, England's last Continental possession, was lost, and England was smarting under this loss when Elizabeth succeeded to the throne and to the debts and debased coinage of her predecessors. Elizabeth at once made Cecil her secretary, and he remained her devoted servant and adviser until his death in 1598, when his son took his place. Favourites—such as Leicester, Essex, and Raleigh—give a handle to those who care to discuss the private character of England's rulers. The exact truth can never be known, and this perhaps makes the subject fascinating; but those who judge monarchs by the work they do for the lands they govern will find little to blame in the policy which Cecil pursued under the orders of his Queen. The supremacy of the Pope was once more abolished, and a form of service was introduced which was intended to please all schools of religious thought, and, to a large extent, answered the wishes of its designers.

The difficult question of Scotland was solved with equal wisdom. In 1560 an English army helped Knox and the Scotch unionists to expel the French. When their task was done the English withdrew, and the Scotch were left to sever themselves from France and Rome in their own way. At the end of this year

Francis II. died and the French power over Scotland ceased. England was recompensed for the loss of Calais by the love of Scotland. Scotch reformers would have married Elizabeth to the Earl of Arran and thus united Great Britain; but Elizabeth was wiser. War would have interfered with the work Cecil had to do for England, and Mary's followers would have fought for their Queen; hence in 1560 the fate of Scotland was left to a Scotch Parliament, which broke with Rome and removed the great obstacle to the union of Great Britain.

Good fortune favoured Elizabeth from first to last. The wars of religion distracted France during the greater part of her reign. In 1562 an English force occupied Havre in order to aid the Huguenots in the first religious war. When French Catholics and Protestants forgot their differences and joined in expelling the English, Elizabeth laid the lesson to heart. Henceforward the French were allowed to fight their civil wars without the interference of an English army. In 1559 Philip II. of Spain left the Netherlands, enraged with subjects who demanded redress of grievances before they would vote supply. For eleven years there was trouble brewing in the Low Countries. Then followed the eighty years' war of Dutch independence. Again Elizabeth interfered only when England's interests were vitally affected. Thus the Queen was able to restore England's finance and coinage, and, whilst France and Spain were weakened by discord, England, guided by Elizabeth and Cecil, increased her productive power, added foreign commerce to home production, and began to build the greatest Empire which has ever existed.

## XIX

### INCREASE OF ENGLAND'S NAVAL POWER
### 1560–1585

A DEPUTATION of Hanse merchants approached Queen Elizabeth in 1560. They were received with the greatest courtesy, but were told that they must no longer expect more favourable treatment than their English competitors, and that German trade with England would in future be regulated in the interests of the English. They were also told that they would have to give English merchants in their German ports the same rights as they were allowed in England. When foreign commerce was thus brought under national control, Parliament prohibited the importation of many articles which were being imported from Antwerp although they could be made in England. This prohibition was at once felt in the Netherlands, since the Hanse merchants could no longer carry the forbidden goods. Commercial relations between England and the dominions of Philip II. of Spain were broken off; but the English found a market for their cloth at Emden, from which port it could be sold to the inhabitants of the Low Countries or Germany. Although Spanish ships were pillaged in the Narrow Seas, Spain had to submit to the insult in order to

save Antwerp's trade from ruin. In 1564 Anglo-Spanish trade was resumed on terms dictated by England. The empire of traders was too weak to wage a commercial war with a nation of producers.

Mining was encouraged and the smelting of iron. Alum works were started in the Isle of Wight. Cecil was personally interested in this venture, which for a time succeeded and then failed. Alum was the one thing needed to give England absolute supremacy in cloth-making. From the surface rock which had been weathered alum could be easily prepared, but the working of deeper deposits was a secret jealously guarded by the Pope. Just before Elizabeth's death this difficulty was overcome. Italian alum-workers were smuggled out of papal territory. Alum works were started in Yorkshire, and England had an ample supply of cheap alum with which she could finish her rough cloth.

From the time of Edward III. the exportation of iron was forbidden, that English iron-workers might have a cheap and abundant supply of raw material. When this measure was supplemented by the protection given to finished iron goods, the industry made rapid progress. The Elizabethan English were, however, too wise to sacrifice strength for wealth. It was not until much later that the method of using coal in iron-smelting was invented. The use of charcoal necessitated a great consumption of wood, and this endangered the growth of English shipping; hence the use of wood, growing near the coast and rivers, in iron-smelting was forbidden by repeated Acts of Parliament. Cecil prepared the way for Howard,

Drake, Hawkins, and the defeat of the Armada, just as at a later date Pitt and Barham made it possible for Nelson to do his duty at Trafalgar. One article, in particular, had the honour of a special statute, frequently re-enacted, prohibiting its importation. Free-trade economists argue that to produce cheaply raw materials and instruments used in manufacture should be imported duty free. The Elizabethan English thought otherwise, for wool-cards were the subject of the statute. According to the free-trade theory English cloth-making ought to have been injured by the statute prohibiting the importation of foreign wool-cards, but, in fact, England before long made not only the best cloth but the best wool-cards. This ounce of fact is worth tons of theory. Elizabeth inherited a debased coinage and debts contracted by her brother and her sister. Though prices continued to rise in her reign, the efficiency of her protective system enabled her to restore the coinage, discharge the debts, and maintain the navy without resorting to excessive taxation. Whilst England's production was protected, Cecil enforced rigid economy in governmental departments. Thus England could afford to subsidise the struggling Protestants in France and the Netherlands. In defiance of the laws of free trade England became wealthy, and, better still, she became strong.

The Merchant Adventurers, who carried English cloth to Antwerp in competition with the Hanse merchants, were encouraged by government. In 1581 a Levant company was incorporated in order to trade with the Turk, and these merchants in 1584 sent

English cloth to the Persian Gulf and Goa. The Muscovy merchants, incorporated in Mary's reign, also opened up trade with Persia by the old Scandinavian route of the Russian rivers. The Germans had built ships for England, and carried naval stores, tar, and hemp from the Baltic. This was probably the reason why they retained their privileges for so long a time. Timid hearts could urge that they were indispensable, if England was to have a strong navy; but timidity was not a characteristic of the England of Elizabeth, and an English Eastland Company replaced the Easterlings.

At first Elizabeth was too poor to do much for the navy, but money was found to buy ships from the Germans and powder and cannon in Antwerp. But soon after Elizabeth's accession shipbuilding and the manufacture of cannon and gunpowder were developed in England. The *Jesus of Lübeck* was the last ship bought from the Germans. Merchant shipping grew apace, and every merchant ship was a potential man-of-war. To encourage English shipping the coasting trade of England was reserved for English ships. In this way a navy was created which delivered England when the Spanish Armada came, saw, and was conquered.

The English were not a seafaring race when Elizabeth began her reign. Yet, before it was over, they had commenced to regard the sea as their own. Cabot's voyages were soon forgotten. Whilst England was in alliance with Spain and still acknowledged the supremacy of the Pope, the French were pushing their way into Canada and giving the name of New France

to North America. When the Reformation spread to France, Huguenots, aided by Admiral Coligny, settled at first in Brazil, and, when this experiment failed, in Florida, whence as pirates they attacked the commerce and colonies of Spain. Before the English broke through the monopolies of Portugal and Spain by collecting slaves on the Guinea Coast and selling them in the West Indies, Frenchmen had engaged in this lucrative trade. Preying upon the Spaniard and Protestantism were closely connected in the sixteenth century, but, as France and Spain were almost always at war, the Catholic Kings of France winked at the religious errors of subjects who robbed Spanish ships of American gold.

After the death of Henry II. of France in 1559 his widow, Catherine de Medici, directed the official policy of France for thirty years, during the reigns of her three sons. This policy aimed at restoring peace to Europe by re-establishing a purified papal power. It also involved the suppression of the Huguenots. During the French civil wars their infant colonial empire perished, and the English took over the task of fighting the Spanish monopoly. The collapse of Spain in 1564, after her short-lived commercial war with England, was followed by English attacks on her jealously guarded American empire. In Mary's reign English ships first visited the Guinea Coast in defiance of the Portuguese monopoly. John Hawkins went there in 1562 and carried slaves to Hayti, where he sold them, "trusting the Spaniards no further than by his own strength he was able still to master them."

This private venture was so successful that in 1564

Hawkins sailed in command of some of the Queen's ships, including the *Jesus of Lübeck*, to Guinea and thence with slaves to the West Indies, where, after much trouble owing to the absence of a licence from the King of Spain, the slaves were sold. On his way to England Hawkins succoured the pirate colony of the French in Florida, and he met other Frenchmen, engaged in the unlicensed slave-trade, in Africa and in the West Indies. The sailor, who wrote of this second venture in unlicensed slave-trading, was able to end his tale with thanksgiving to God, since there was "great profit to the venturers of the said voyage, as also to the whole realm, in bringing home both gold, silver, pearls, and other jewels great store. His name, therefore, be praised for evermore. Amen." Hawkins' third voyage ended in failure. Trapped by the Spanish fleet, treacherously according to Hawkins, the *Jesus* was lost, and, after much suffering, Hawkins returned in one small ship, and his cousin, Francis Drake, in another. The experiences of the English prisoners in the prisons of the Inquisition filled England with hatred of Rome and Spain.

In 1567 Philip sent the Duke of Alva overland to the Netherlands with an army which was strong enough to crush all opposition to Spanish rule. Ships containing pay for Alva's troops were driven to take refuge at Plymouth and Elizabeth confiscated the treasure. Alva was then forced to tax the Netherlands. This taxation, coupled with the stoppage of commerce between England and Antwerp, drove the Low Countries into open rebellion, and the war of Dutch Independence began. Already, it is true, William of

Orange had been outlawed and was trying to invade the Netherlands with foreign mercenaries; but, after the taxation, the Netherlands united in defence of their autonomy.

At first, however, William of Orange lacked the money required before the Spanish could be effectively attacked. The poor folk in the Netherlands subscribed towards William's war fund, but the rich held aloof. Enough was, nevertheless, collected to equip eighteen vessels at the Huguenot port of La Rochelle. These ships carried William's letters of marque and crews of lawless seamen, who called themselves Sea-Beggars. They seized three hundred Spanish vessels within a few months, and disposed of their booty in England. Representations from the Spanish Ambassador forced Elizabeth to forbid this use of English harbours. Then in 1572 the Sea-Beggars seized the Dutch port of Brill, and Holland rose in revolt.

Meanwhile negotiations were proceeding between England and France which had in view the expulsion of the Spanish from the Netherlands and the division of the country between England, France, and Germany. A religious peace was to be proclaimed in France, and the Protestant heir-expectant, Henry of Navarre, was married to the daughter of Catherine de Medici. Six days after the marriage the Huguenot magnates who had come to Paris were massacred on the Feast of St. Bartholomew 1572. Henry of Navarre was spared, but Admiral Coligny was killed. Civil war recommenced, and the expansion of France oversea was checked for years. Elizabeth, however, remained faithful to the defensive alliance she had made with

France. She had no intention of throwing France into the arms of Spain, and at the same time she would not waste England's strength in a European war. A more effective way of fighting Spain was being thought out in England.

In 1570 and 1571 Drake made voyages to the West Indies of which no particulars are recorded. He had not forgotten the Spanish attack on Hawkins and the misery of his own home-coming. In 1572 he sailed to the Isthmus of Panama, attacked Nombre de Dios, and returned with a rich store of Spanish gold. Then, whilst England and Spain were still officially at peace, another and greater exploit was prepared. In 1577 Drake sailed from Plymouth with a company of 164 men in five ships. He did not return until 1580, and in the interval he sailed through the Straits of Magellan, plundered the unprotected Spanish towns on the east coast of America, fed and clothed his crew from Spanish ships, crossed the Pacific, rounded the Cape of Good Hope, and on his voyage collected from the Spanish seven hundred and fifty thousand pounds.

In 1578 England signed a treaty of alliance with the Netherlands directed against Spain. Philip tried to reply to this unofficial war by creating difficulties for Elizabeth in the British Isles. Mary of Scotland married Lord Darnley in 1565. Her illegitimate half-brother, Lord Moray, joined the party of Knox and the ultra-Protestants and was preparing a rebellion against his sister on account of her sympathy with Rome, when Mary attacked the insurgents with such swiftness that they fled to England. Mary's secretary, Riccio, was suspected of being in the pay of Philip and

the Pope. With the approval of John Knox, Riccio was murdered by Lord Darnley in the presence of his wife and Queen. Lord Moray then returned, and the Queen's councillors were Protestant and pro-English. Mary's son, James, was born in 1566, and Elizabeth was invited to be his godmother. Early in the following year Lord Darnley's body was found under circumstances which pointed to the anti-English Lord Bothwell as the murderer. Scotland rose against her Queen when Mary married Bothwell a few months after Darnley's death. In 1568 Mary fled for shelter to England, and under Moray, as Regent for James, Scotland remained loyal to England.

Philip then devoted his attention to fomenting disaffection amongst the English Catholics in favour of the captive Queen Mary. The great obstacle was Cecil. The Duke of Norfolk led the discontented magnates and Cecil was in danger of sharing Riccio's fate. Elizabeth, however, acted promptly, although her favourite Leicester was one of Cecil's enemies. Norfolk was arrested, and a rising in the North of England was sternly suppressed in 1569. Next year the Pope issued a bull excommunicating Elizabeth and releasing her subjects from their duty of obedience to their Queen. Alva had apparently crushed the Protestants of the Low Countries ; but before the bull was issued Alva's power was weakened by the seizure of Spanish gold at Plymouth. In 1571 the Ridolfi conspiracy was planned by Spain. Elizabeth was to be murdered, Norfolk to be married to Mary of Scotland, and part of Alva's army was to make them Catholic rulers of Great Britain. Cecil, who had been made

Lord Burghley, discovered the plot. Norfolk was executed in 1572, but Mary's life was spared. The defensive alliance with France and the secret aid given to William of Orange were Burghley's answers to the danger which threatened England.

The massacre of St. Bartholomew was a heavy blow to English hopes, but this was more than compensated by the success of the Sea-Beggars and Drake's exploit at Nombre de Dios. In 1572 it was evident that the sea power of Spain was not invincible, and the revolt of the Dutch taxed the resources of Spain so severely that England had rest for seven years. Want of money ruined Spain, although she had sole possession of the gold and silver of Mexico and Peru. In spite of the laws of Spain the precious metals flowed from her to the middlemen of Antwerp and Amsterdam, and through them to England. Until Spain had proved herself incapable of protecting property from her mutinous troops, Antwerp and Amsterdam remained Catholic and loyal to Spain. Their merchants looked upon the revolt as a needless quarrel with their wealthy Spanish clients. The severity of Alva's rule failed to conquer the Dutch, and in 1573 he was replaced by Requesens, who was instructed to try the effect of gentler methods. Holland and Zeeland refused to submit, but the southern provinces acquiesced in the new policy.

The great difficulty which confronted Requesens was his Spanish army, whose pay was always in arrears. Under Alva the plunder of Malines, Zutphen, Naarden, and Haarlem had satisfied the soldiers, but after Requesens had failed to capture Leyden, even the

merchants wavered in their loyalty when they saw the land overrun with hungry and mutinous bandits. Requesens died in 1576, and before his successor, Don John of Austria, an illegitimate son of Charles V., arrived, the mutineers had sacked Antwerp, the richest city in the Low Countries, perhaps in Europe. The horror caused by this outrage against civilisation for a time united the Low Countries. In the Pacification of Ghent the provinces agreed to forget their past divisions and to unite in securing the expulsion of the Spanish soldiers. William of Orange was to be lieutenant, admiral, and general for Philip in Holland and Zeeland until the Spaniards were expelled.

In Spain the necessity of removing the Spanish troops from the Netherlands was by this time clearly recognised, and it was proposed that they should be let loose on England. This proposal was vetoed by the Netherlanders who were loyal to Spain. They saw that Antwerp would be still further injured if the production of England, in which their merchants dealt, was checked. Money was raised on bills drawn in Philip's name and discounted by the Fuggers of Antwerp. The Spanish troops were then sent away by land. There remained a force of German mercenaries, but Don John was pledged to send them also away as soon as the States-General raised funds for their arrears of pay. These mercenaries, however, did not leave, and though open war ceased there was such unrest that Philip sent Alexander of Parma, with 20,000 Spanish troops, to Don John's aid. The insurgents were crushingly defeated at Gemblours in 1578, but on the other hand Amsterdam threw in its lot with Holland

and Zeeland. In the same year Don John died and Parma became Viceroy for Philip.

During the Anglo-French negotiations before the massacre of St. Bartholomew the marriage of Elizabeth with the French King's brother, Henry of Anjou, was suggested and discussed. When it became evident that Elizabeth's suitor would become Henry III. of France, his brother, Francis d'Alençon, afterwards Duke of Anjou, was proposed as a possible husband for Elizabeth. From England, where he had been vainly wooing Elizabeth, a lady of nearly fifty and more than twenty years his senior, Francis of Anjou sailed to Antwerp in 1582 with Elizabeth's old friend, Leicester, and other English nobles. Beneath the grotesque courtship important issues were at stake. In 1581 Francis had been accepted as sovereign of Flanders, Brabant, and the northern provinces, which had repudiated Philip. Antwerp, the great market for English cloth, was owning a new lord, and Elizabeth's ambiguous answer left her free to act in England's interests, if the experiment was successful.

Before long it was evident that the experiment would not succeed. In 1584 Anjou died, and his death was almost immediately followed by the murder of William of Orange. Next year Parma gained possession of Antwerp and all the southern provinces for Philip of Spain. In spite of all the advantages of her protective system the outlook seemed dark for England. In 1581 Philip had seized Portugal, and every non-European market was closed to English goods. When Antwerp was being besieged by the Spaniards in 1585, Elizabeth made a fruitless attempt to induce Henry III.

of France to assume the sovereignty of the Netherlands. The Garter was sent to the French King simultaneously with an embassy from the Netherlands, but the religious divisions of the French forced the King to decline the offer. England had to face Spain aided only by the insurgent Dutch.

It is not easy to trace any fear in England's actions, though there were attempts at maintaining the nominal peace with Spain. The ancient policy of England had been to rely on the Hanse League, but Cecil's policy of giving to the Germans as much and no more than they gave to the English was resolutely adhered to. The Hanse town of Hamburg saw that prosperity followed the settlement of the English Merchant Adventurers in Emden, and in 1567 Hamburg signed a treaty allowing the English to trade within her walls. When the treaty expired in 1577 the other Hanse towns compelled Hamburg to expel the English, and after one year's grace the Merchant Adventurers left. The Germans in London were then placed on the same footing as other foreigners, and a commercial war ensued in which England was able to prove the superiority of a nation which protected her production over rivals who traded in foreign-made goods. Driven from Hamburg the Merchant Adventurers were again welcomed at Emden. When Emden was closed to the English at the Emperor's command, Elbing received them. They were soon after again received openly at Emden and more or less secretly in other Hanse towns. For a short while Hamburg gave them another welcome, and when she once more drove them out in 1587 they moved a few miles down the Elbe and settled

in Stade, which defied the Emperor as Elbing did the King of Poland.

Ceaseless efforts were made to find outlets for English cloth. Mention has already been made of the access to the East opened through Russia and the lands of the Turk, but English ships also sailed to Archangel in 1553, only to find that there was no passage to the East through the icy seas. No better fortune attended the daring seamen who sought a North-West passage round the American coast.

At the same time attempts were made to found colonies in North America. Though these failed, from the lessons the failures taught, the English learned the method of creating dominions oversea. Good fortune, on the other hand, attended Drake when, in September 1585, he sailed with about thirty ships from Plymouth to avenge the fall of Antwerp. Touching first at Spain, where he boldly took in fresh water and provisions, Drake sailed to the West Indies by way of the Cape Verde Islands. His progress was marked by sacked and burned Spanish towns and ships, and he returned with sixty thousand pounds taken from the Spaniards. It was evident that nothing but a direct attack could subdue England, and preparations for it were now made.

## XX

### THE ARMADA. ENGLISH AND DUTCH OBTAIN CONTROL OF THE SEA

1585–1601

BEFORE his abdication in 1555 Charles V. had learned that it was beyond the power of one man simultaneously to unite the German Empire and Western Europe in a cosmopolitan brotherhood. But it was not clear that the cosmopolitan scheme would not succeed if one member of his family attacked the problem in Germany and another in Western Europe. If Germany and Western Europe were welded into two federations, both in subjection to Rome, intermarriage between the Spanish and Austrian Habsburgs would sooner or later blend the two federations into one cosmopolitan Empire. Hence Charles' brother became the Emperor Ferdinand, and Charles' son became Philip II. of Spain and of Spain's dominions in Europe and beyond the sea.

This great scheme failed not because the Habsburgs wavered in their loyalty to cosmopolitanism but because the peoples over whom they ruled took arms to support their nationality. Ferdinand's son and heir, afterwards Maximilian II., was married in 1548 to his cousin, Maria, daughter of Charles V. In spite of his Spanish wife and the Spanish influences which

surrounded him, Maximilian, before his accession in 1564 to the Empire of Germany, showed strong leanings towards Protestantism and German nationalism. He received, however, a plain intimation that, if he declined to fall in with the cosmopolitan scheme he would have to abandon all hope of becoming Emperor, and he yielded to the pressure. Maximilian and his son, Rudolf II., Emperor from 1576 to 1612, maintained intimate relations with Spain, whilst they avoided making a direct attack on Protestantism. The absence of protection for German workers, peasants, and artisans weakened Protestantism and German nationality. The wealth of Germany passed into the hands of her international merchants, who could invest their capital in foreign lands and favoured a close connection with Spain. The Jesuits, who were labouring to bring Europe back to Catholicism, met with great success in Germany. Time appeared to be on the side of cosmopolitanism in the German Empire.

But in Western Europe Philip II. had a more difficult task. The people of the Netherlands had partially succeeded in throwing off the yoke of Spain. Amsterdam and the North had won freedom, whilst Antwerp and the South had bought peace by rejoining the Spanish Empire, when the murder of William of Orange in 1584 left the Dutch without a leader. Spain's agents were at work in every land. The Catholics of England and Ireland were being taught that their religion demanded rebellion against Elizabeth, and there were grave fears that the Queen would share the fate of William of Orange. The British Isles were to become dependencies of Spain under

Mary Stewart. Even James of Scotland, alarmed by the strength and zeal of the Scotch Catholics, pursued a hesitating and doubtful policy.

Nor could Elizabeth turn to France for aid. Since the peace of Cateau-Cambrésis in 1660 there had been no open war between France and Spain, but the religious wars in France had ended in the formation of a Catholic League led by Henry, Duke of Guise, and a Huguenot opposition whose chief was Henry of Navarre. The French King, Henry III., had failed to reconcile his subjects in 1576 owing to the opposition of the League. In 1585 a definite alliance was formed between the League and Philip of Spain, and Henry III. was forced to submit to the authority of Henry of Guise and his brother the Cardinal.

Threatened on all sides, Elizabeth was forced to abandon her policy of masterly inactivity, and in 1585 the Queen's favourite, Leicester, landed in Flushing with 5000 foot and 1000 horse to fill the place which the murder of William of Orange had left vacant. This post was one which an Englishman was ill-qualified to fill. Englishmen still talk of the Dutch Republic, although not long after the final severance from Spain de Witt pointed out that the English should talk of what is now the kingdom of Holland as the Federated Republics. Leicester, accustomed to the ways of a united kingdom, was called upon to guide the fortunes of seven provinces which had never been really united and had now joined in a federation so loose that each province, and almost each town, was practically an independent State. The name republic serves only to conceal the fact that the Dutch had no political

freedom. Towns were governed by councils of burghers which co-opted fresh members when vacancies occurred and elected deputies to the States-General. The Dutch were governed by merchants whose right to rule was based on their wealth, and chief amongst these were the merchants of Amsterdam.

The people of Holland closely resembled the English. In Holland, as in England, the people were fighting to preserve their nationality; in both lands there were more Catholics than Protestants, but difference of religion did not affect their zeal for the national cause. Here, however, the likeness ceased. In England the Queen was as ardent a nationalist as her subjects. In Holland the mercantile governing body fought Spain in order to carry to and from the East and West. They were, many of them, Jews who had been driven from Spain and Portugal, or foreigners who had migrated from Antwerp. Such men could have little sympathy with the patriotic hopes and fears of the Dutch. Leicester began his rule by forbidding all commercial intercourse between the Dutch and Philip's dominions. He had no wish to supply the enemies of England with food and clothing when they could be starved into submission. But the merchants claimed the right of trading freely, and gladly supplied the Spaniards with all they were ready to pay for, even with powder and shot to be used against the Dutch and their English allies. After wasting his fortune in a hopeless struggle with the merchants, Leicester returned to England in August 1587 a poor but wiser man. Then Maurice, a younger son of William of Orange, at the age of twenty commanded

the Dutch military and naval forces against Parma, the best general in Europe.

In the ports of Spain and Portugal the Invincible Armada was being built, and in the Southern Netherlands Parma was collecting men and transports, buying what he needed from the merchants of Amsterdam, that he might be ready to sail for England when the Armada had brushed aside the Dutch and English fleets. But in 1587 Drake sailed from England before the Armada was fully equipped. He looked in at Cadiz and destroyed all the shipping which failed to escape up the creeks. He found Lisbon too strong; but he waited outside and destroyed coasting vessels as they arrived with stores. The Armada could not sail that year, and, had Drake been able to keep the sea, it might never have sailed. But his ships needed refitting, so Drake returned to England after capturing an East Indiaman, which paid for the expedition. In 1588 Drake was kept in England, because it was hoped that Philip would not send the Armada after his fleet had been crippled. Nevertheless the Armada sailed.

In spite of the gold of America, Spain was poor, owing to a fiscal system which threw the whole burden of taxation on the home producer. Neglect of the navy had given Drake the opportunity he had used so well. But in 1588 nothing was spared. It was, however, too late. An English navy was in existence capable of guarding England's coasts. The Dutch ships held Parma in check, whilst the English harried the Invincible Armada. Northwards it fled in confusion. One-third of the ships, battered and tempest-

tossed, found their way to Spain round the north of Scotland; the shallows and the storm had the rest. England and Protestantism were saved.

The destruction of the Armada freed Western Europe. French Nationalists, Catholics and Protestants, united against the League. During the last few days of 1588 the Guises were murdered, and in April 1589 the alliance of Henry III. and Henry of Navarre was publicly announced. The League held Paris, and Mayenne, brother of the murdered Henry of Guise, took over the command of the pro-Spanish party. Philip made a desperate attempt to conquer France. Walloons and Flemings were sent to reinforce the army of the League. In August 1589 the murder of the Guises was avenged by a friar who stabbed Henry III. Before his death the French King acknowledged Henry of Navarre as his successor. In March 1590 Henry IV. routed the army of the League at Ivry. Philip then sent Parma, his best general, to the aid of his allies, whilst England sent reinforcements for the Nationalists. In 1592 Parma's health failed, and he returned to Flanders, where he died before the end of the year. Then the Leaguers lost heart. Henry IV. was reconciled to the Church of Rome, French Catholics and Protestants accepted him as King, and the French wars of religion dwindled into ineffective attempts to impede the establishment of a strong national government in France.

In 1587, when England was threatened by the Invincible Armada, Mary of Scotland was beheaded in Fotheringay Castle, in which she was living as a

State prisoner. It was nominally on her behalf that the Armada was about to sail, and the Catholic plots against Elizabeth's life had as their object the placing of Mary on the thrones of England and Scotland. After Mary's death, English Catholics realised that to oppose Elizabeth was to aid Philip in his attack on English nationality, and, in spite of persecution, the Catholics in England were loyal to their native land. James' hesitation disappeared when the Armada was defeated. In 1589 he married the Protestant princess, Anne of Denmark, and the movement towards the union of England and Scotland continued to make headway.

In 1580, papal soldiers, subjects of Philip of Spain, landed in Ireland, entrenched themselves at Smerwick, and encouraged the Earl of Desmond to rebel. When this rebellion was suppressed half a million acres in Munster were forfeited to the Crown, and an attempt was made to plant English settlers on the confiscated lands. Ten years earlier the Irish Parliament had passed protective measures to encourage the weaving of linen yarn in Ireland. This yarn was used by weavers in Lancashire and Cheshire, and royal letters patent annulled these protective statutes. Thus, although Ireland was treated as a conquered country, in which English settlers were to act as a permanent self-supporting garrison, these unpaid soldiers of England were denied that protection which their English brethren enjoyed. This economic policy transformed English Protestants into Irish Catholics, and created the need for fresh harryings of Ireland and more plantations, which, in their turn, failed.

The settlers retained their language, and in English expressed their hatred of the land which treated them as foreigners. Disaffection in Ireland, fostered by Spain, troubled and impoverished England during Elizabeth's reign.

The decay of Spain was evident to all except the Spanish after the destruction of the Armada. In spite of the gold of America, the Spanish policy of neglecting home production had forced Charles V. to regard the Low Countries as the financial centre of his empire. But the commerce of the Spanish Netherlands was ruined in the war. The great seaport, Antwerp, was blocked by forts built by the Dutch to command the waterway to the sea, and England was helping to strangle Antwerp, since she held Flushing, at the mouth of the waterway, as one of the cautionary towns given as pledges for the expenses incurred when Leicester was sent to the Netherlands. Ostend was held by the Dutch. When the Armada sailed, Dunkirk, Nieuwport, and Sluys were the only ports from which Parma's army could have sailed to England, and these ports were of little or no value when the English and Dutch held command of the sea. Yet blind to their weakness, the Spanish continued to believe that they could conquer England.

In 1589 Drake sailed south to detach Portugal from Spain. Don Antonio was to have been made King of Portugal, and, in return, he promised that the English should have the same commercial rights as the Portuguese in Portugal, Brazil, and the Indies. This expedition failed, and more than a century elapsed before the Methuen treaty, in 1703, gave English

products the longed-for preference in Portugal and her colonies. Drake and Hawkins died in 1596 whilst they were engaged in their favourite work of pillaging the Spanish West Indies; but in the same year Cadiz was also pillaged by a mixed English and Dutch expedition. With this destruction of Spanish shipping Spain's last hope of invading England died. Two years later Philip II. was succeeded by his son, Philip III.

Off Lisbon, in 1589, Drake captured a large fleet of Hanseatic corn-ships which had sailed round Scotland to avoid English ships in the Channel. The corn was confiscated as contraband of war, and Elizabeth refused to listen to the remonstrances of the merchants. The Emperor of Germany then expelled English merchants from his dominions; but the English carried on a contraband trade through the Dutch town Middelburgh. When the Hanseatic merchants forbade the sale of corn to the Dutch, Elizabeth turned the Germans out of the Steelyard. In 1599 Emden and Stade again admitted English merchants, and the Hanseatic League was hoping to settle the dispute by negotiation when Elizabeth died in 1603. Ultimately the Germans returned to their Steelyard, but as unprivileged foreigners they were henceforward of little account in England's commerce.

Although the Dutch were as seriously threatened as the English by the Armada, in 1589 the English captured Dutch as well as Hanseatic ships carrying corn to Spain, and the States-General asked Elizabeth to release the ships and corn. They urged that they depended wholly on commerce, and that the merchants

would forsake Amsterdam if their trade was disturbed. The Dutch people were brave, self-sacrificing, and patriotic. Their sailors were in no way inferior to the English. But the Republics were ruled by merchants who thought only of buying cheap and selling dear. The Dutch employed their sailors in opening up trading stations in the East and West, whilst England used her sea power to found colonies and create markets for her products.

When the Spanish Netherlands was denied access to the sea, there was a great exodus of artisans to England and to Holland. A most interesting account of the effect of the fiscal systems of England and the Dutch on this emigration is given in de Witt's "Interest of Holland." When Antwerp was taken, "that City being thus wholly shut up from the Sea, and the King of Spain very imprudently neglecting to open the Scheld, being desirous, according to the Maxims of Monarchs, to weaken that strong City, which he thought too powerful for him, and to disperse the Traffick over his many other Cities; he bent all his Strength against the Frontiers of Gelderland, England, and France, whereby the Merchants of Antwerp were necessitated to forsake their City, and consequently to chuse Amsterdam to settle in, which before the Troubles was, next to Antwerp, the greatest Mercantile City of the Netherlands. For when we rightly consider the innumerable Inconveniences found in all Islands, and especially Northward, by reason of Storms, and long Winters, in the Consumption of Goods bought, and the necessary Communication with many inland Neighbours; every one may easily

imagine why the Antwerpers sat not down in the adjacent Islands of Zeland; and besides, neither in France nor England was there any liberty of Religion, but a Monarchical Government in both with high Duties on Goods imported and exported."

"And tho the Protestant Merchants, by reason of the great Peace, and good situation of England, would have most inclined to settle there; yet were they discouraged from coming into a Country where there were no City Excises or Imposts on Lands, or any other Taxes equally charging all, whether Inhabitants or Strangers; but heavy Taxes and Customs laid on all Goods imported and exported, by which Foreigners and their Children and Grandchildren, according to the Laws of the Land, must pay double as much as the natural English; yea in the Subsidies of Parliament, which extend to perpetuity on Foreigners and their Children, they must pay double Assessment: Besides which all Strangers are excluded from their Guilds and Halls of Trade and Manufactures; so that none have the Freedom there to work, either as Journey-man, or Master-workman, save in that whereof the Inhabitants are ignorant."

"And all these Discouragements were also for the most part in the Eastern Cities" (Hanse towns); "yea in England as well as in the Eastern Cities, a Foreigner, tho an Inhabitant, was not suffered to sell to any other but Citizens; nor to sell Wares by Retail, or for Consumption, or to buy any sort of Goods of Strangers or of Inhabitants that are Strangers, neither by Wholesale nor Retail: All which made them think England no fit place to settle in. . . . The Flemish

Fishing also fell into Holland: But the Manufactures were thus divided; one third of the Dealers and Weavers of Says, Damask, and Stockings, &c., went casually into England, &c., because that Trade was then new to the English, and therefore under no Halls or Guilds. Another great part of them went to Leyden; and the Traders in Linen settled mostly at Haerlem. But there was still a great number of Traders in Manufactures that remained in Flanders and Brabant: For seeing those Goods were continually sent to France and Germany by Land-carriage, it was impossible for us to prevent it by our Ships of War, or any other Means imaginable."

An old rhyme declares that

> Hops, Reformation, Bays, and Beer
> Came into England all in a year.

These immigrant weavers of says and bays were Protestants of a pronounced type. They settled in the Eastern Counties, where they preached their gospel of disunion in religion and politics to the children of those who had been dispossessed by enclosures and massacred in Ket's rebellion. De Witts and le Bruns became Whites and Browns and with the descendants of the old Levellers formed the English Independents, who half a century after Elizabeth's death temporarily abolished royalty in England. In 1593 the danger to English nationality was recognised, and an Act was passed imposing exile or conformity to the Church of England on all who lived in England; but, driven below the surface, sectarianism continued to increase.

Lord Burghley continued to advise Elizabeth until

his death in 1598, when his place was filled by his son, Sir Robert Cecil. Burghley was opposed by the Queen's favourite, Leicester, but never with success. When Leicester died in 1588, the Earl of Essex and Sir Walter Raleigh became the favourites of Elizabeth. Essex succeeded to Leicester's feud with the Cecils. Just before his death Burghley wished England to make peace with Spain as France was doing. The English merchants feared that their trade would suffer if they made peace with Spain whilst the Dutch were forcibly entering Spain's empire oversea. Essex espoused the cause of the merchants, and attacked Burghley with such violence that he lost Elizabeth's favour. The peace party was defeated, but Essex accepted the Vice-royalty of Ireland, hoping to re-instate himself with his Queen. He, however, failed in Ireland, and after a prolonged trial was deprived of all his offices. In his anger Essex asked James of Scotland to send an army to remove Cecil from the Queen's Council. Detected in treason, Essex appealed in vain to the merchants of London to take arms against Cecil. He was beheaded in 1601. Raleigh and Cecil, however, remained on friendly terms until just before Elizabeth's death.

# XXI

## TRADE RIVALRY BETWEEN ENGLISH AND DUTCH

### 1601–1623

A SERIOUS constitutional difficulty was created when England's foreign trade passed into English hands. The Crown had authority over foreign merchants trading in England, and could either prohibit or impose duties on their trade. In virtue of her royal prerogative Queen Elizabeth deprived the merchants of the Steelyard of their privileges. The rights of the Crown over foreign trade conducted by Englishmen were not clearly defined. At first there was no practical difficulty in this uncertainty. If English merchants evaded an imposition or restriction they gained an advantage over their foreign competitors, and when the English Merchant Adventurers were a feeble folk the Crown revenue was not seriously affected. But when foreign trade was largely conducted by English merchants, the Crown had to choose between surrendering a large part of its revenue or asserting its right to impose duties on foreign trade whether it was conducted by natives or aliens.

This difficulty was increased by the rise in prices. The ancient customs, from which the Crown had drawn much of its revenue, were satisfied by the

payment of fixed sums of money for fixed amounts of goods. When goods rose in value and money fell the Crown suffered. In Elizabeth's time trouble was staved off by the treasure stolen from Spain and by the sale of monopolies. Nevertheless, Elizabeth was forced to alienate a large part of her Crown lands in order to obtain funds for the defence of England, and her successors were thus driven to depend upon the customs for their revenue. Monopolies, in themselves, were no more immoral than modern patents. To encourage the expenditure of capital in starting new industries or in diverting old industries into new channels, exclusive rights of manufacture were granted to individuals by the Crown. In the same way monopolies of trade in different parts of the world were given to chartered associations of merchants in order that they might arm their ships and defend themselves without leaning upon the royal navy. The expense of policing the seas could not have been borne by some merchants if others might trade without sharing this expense. Elizabeth's last Parliament, in 1601, was about to pass an Act abolishing monopolies when the Queen announced her intention of cancelling all monopolies which were injurious to her people.

The greatest difficulty which the Stuarts had to face was, however, the rapid progress made by Dutch merchants in the race for wealth. The Dutch merchants grew rich by slipping through the breach in Spain's monopoly which English guns had made. They founded their Eastern empire when England was fighting Spain in order that no new Armada should threaten either her coasts or those of her ally.

Pamphlet literature in England teemed with envy of the Dutch and suggestions as to how England too could become wealthy. In observations supposed to have been presented to King James by Raleigh, stress is laid upon the small customs paid by Dutch merchants. The writer argued that, although English merchants paid eighteen times as much duty as Dutch merchants, England obtained only half the amount of revenue that Holland received. He urged the King to make full use of the alum which had been found in England, "considering that God hath enabled, and given Your Majesty, power to advance Dressing and Dyeing and Transporting of all your Cloths within a Year or two; I speak it knowingly."

James acted upon the suggestion of securing the cloth-finishing industry for England. In 1609 the alum industry of England was protected against foreign competition and grew rapidly. The sale of alum was also made a royal monopoly. In 1614 the exportation of undressed and undyed cloth was forbidden, and the licence of the Merchant Adventurers to export such cloth was revoked. A very large number of Dutch workers were employed in finishing English cloth, and the Dutch retaliated by prohibiting the importation of finished cloth from England and enlarging their weaving industry. This commercial war was short-lived. It ended in a compromise, but victory rested with the English. Their cheap alum and cheap cloth gave them supremacy in every process in the cloth-making industry.

The paternal government of the first Stuarts provoked much opposition from those outside the circle

of beneficiaries. In James' first Parliament a measure granting freedom of trade was carried in the Commons but thrown out by the Lords. The term free trade has, however, had many meanings. To-day it means the right to import goods, whether they are raw materials or finished manufactures, without payment of duty. In the reign of James I. it could also mean either the abolition of the exclusive rights of the companies, chartered by the Tudors, to England's foreign trade, or the abolition of those monopolies which restricted the manufacture and sale of certain articles to privileged individuals. The free-trade measure which was defeated in James' first Parliament was an attack on the chartered trading companies. Better success attended the attack on monopolies in 1624. Then monopolies were made illegal with certain exceptions, such as saltpetre, gunpowder, cannon, alum, &c., which were regarded as beneficial to the State. New inventions could also be made monopolies for fourteen years by royal letters patent, and the trading monopolies of the chartered companies were not interfered with.

The abolition of monopolies, except new patents, was undoubtedly a wise measure; but it does not follow that monopolies were harmful when they were introduced. In a backward country, which sought to introduce manufactures from abroad, they stimulated new industries just as the granting of patents stimulates new inventions. It was after the industries were established in England that monopolies became injurious by limiting home competition and production. Similarly, when policing the seas was beyond

the power of England's navy, it was wise to restrict foreign trade to large corporations who could afford to send fleets of armed merchant ships to foreign lands. The Dutch were building up a great foreign trade by means of companies possessing exclusive rights, and the massacre of English merchants at Amboina by their Dutch rivals in 1624 proved that the time had not yet arrived when treaties or agreements could protect the weak in the fierce struggle for commerce.

After the defeat of the Armada, English and Dutch merchants invaded the Eastern monopoly of the united nations of Spain and Portugal. The early failures of individual English merchants led to the formation in 1600 of the English East India Company. The first fleet of the new company sailed to the East in 1601. It traded in Sumatra, established a factory in Java, captured a Portuguese ship in the Straits of Malacca, and returned with a valuable cargo of pepper. In 1602 the Dutch founded their East India Company with a capital nineteen times that of the English company. James, in 1604, made peace with Spain, one condition being that the English might trade where they had traded before the war. This was, however, interpreted as meaning that the English might trade in all places not actually occupied by the Spanish or Portuguese. The Dutch continued their war with Spain, and in 1615, after destroying the Spanish fleet, began to create a colonial empire in the Spice Islands. The Dutch were unwilling to allow the English to trade in colonies whose garrisons and upkeep were paid for by the merchants of the Republic. To avert a threatened Anglo-Dutch war in

the East an agreement was arrived at between the Dutch and English companies in 1519. But arrangements made in Europe were disregarded in the East. After the massacre at Amboina England failed to obtain reparation from Holland and the English ceased to trade in the Spice Islands, whilst the Dutch colonial empire and trade continued to increase.

The Dutch visited Japan in 1609 and established a trading settlement, although the Japanese forbade them to profess Christianity publicly. Nearly a century earlier the Portuguese had visited China in 1511, and in 1557 they were allowed to lease Macao. In 1622 the Dutch attacked Macao, but failed to capture it. Then they established themselves in Formosa and used every means to obtain a footing for trade in China. That two Dutch embassies were the only European envoys who kow-towed to the Emperor of China is characteristic of this merchant State, which had fought for freedom from Spanish rule only to be governed by cosmopolitan merchants. But the vast wealth which these merchants brought to Holland blinded the Dutch to every other consideration.

After the massacre at Amboina English traders went no further east than India until wars with England had taught the Dutch to respect Englishmen. Not content with driving English traders from the Far East, the Dutch threatened the English in India and the Persian Gulf, where Englishmen had acquired a somewhat precarious footing. On his accession James I. began to develop his policy of peace with foreign powers and consolidation at home. Parliament defeated his project of uniting Great Britain,

but Ulster was planted with settlers in his reign. Peace was made with Spain in 1604, and, except for the unfortunate expedition to Germany just before James' death, England remained at peace with all men. This Anglo-Spanish peace gave the Dutch an opportunity which they seized. As enemies of Spain and Portugal, they forcibly penetrated Portuguese possessions in the East, whilst the English advanced cautiously and diplomatically. The Dutch admiral, Heemskerk, had once laboured in vain to find a North-East passage to the East which could not be blocked by Spain. In 1607 the Spanish navy was anchored under the guns of Gibraltar ready to intercept Dutch traders. A Dutch fleet under Heemskerk attacked and annihilated the Spaniards. Like Nelson, Heemskerk died in the hour of victory, but his life's work was accomplished. The way to the East was wide open for the Dutch, and in 1609 they signed a twelve years' truce with Spain.

There is much to be said for James' peace policy. England's two chief competitors, Spain and Holland, contained within themselves germs of decay, and their doom was certain without England's interference. Spain's neglect of her producers and her reliance on American gold were busily undermining her strength. Moriscos, that is Moors, who had embraced Christianity and remained in Spain, were keeping scientific agriculture and industry alive in the Peninsula. Part of the American gold and silver remained in the hands of the Moriscos and formed a store of capital which Philip II. had tapped when he needed money for his navies and his cosmopolitan schemes. Oppressed by

this heavy taxation and by their Spanish neighbours, who envied them their wealth, the Moriscos had engaged in treasonable correspondence with Elizabeth. James forwarded this correspondence to Philip III. as a peace offering, and Spanish consumers in 1609 drove out the last of Spain's producers. Lord Burghley's son, Robert Cecil, was the King's adviser. The elder Cecil organised the defeat of the Armada; the younger secured that Spain should never again threaten the shores of England. Robert Cecil had earned the dignity of Earl of Salisbury, which James conferred upon him after the peace with Spain.

During the twelve years' truce with Spain the loose federation, called the Dutch Republic, disclosed its weakness. In times of war the need of a military leader and of some sort of national union was felt, but during peace there was nothing to curb the despotic power of the wealthy merchants. Hence the merchants advocated peace at any price, provided their trade was not affected, whilst a large section of the Dutch realised that without foreign war they could never gain freedom and national unity. In 1609 the great bank of Amsterdam was founded, and proved from the first a wonderful success. Their skill in finance and their political power in Holland enabled the merchants to bury in the vaults of the bank the gold and silver of the Dutch as well as the specie of foreigners. An old writer says: "By means of this bank the magistrates of Amsterdam are possessed of the bulk of the property of their inhabitants, and thereby have the strongest security for their fidelity." Holders of bank paper dared not oppose those who

held the bullion which gave value to the paper. Though the Dutch army was largely composed of foreign mercenaries, the Dutch navy was manned by Dutch sailors whose courage and devotion to their country prove that the Netherlands might have become a united nation but for the merchant rulers.

The twelve years' truce all but destroyed the Dutch federation. Prince Maurice, son of William of Orange, was Stadtholder and Captain-General of the Republic. He was naturally also the leader of the unionist party, and as long as war with Spain was necessary to the merchants Maurice and Oldenbarneveldt, the spokesman for local privileges, worked harmoniously together. When Heemskerk destroyed the navy of Spain and made the way to the East safe for the merchants Oldenbarneveldt advocated peace with Spain. Maurice knew the danger of peace and opposed it. In the end a truce was signed, and at once civil strife began. The one bond of union which the Dutch possessed was their orthodox Calvinist creed. Though the Netherlands contained a large number of Catholics and Jews, the fact that Calvinism was the State religion in all the provinces tended to draw these provinces together. In the seventeenth century political differences still almost invariably disguised themselves as religious quarrels. Two rival sects divided Holland—Gomarists and Arminians. The former advocated the maintenance of the Calvinist creed and the State Church, the latter preached a more liberal faith and religious toleration.

Oldenbarneveldt led the Arminians and Maurice the Gomarists, though they took little or no interest

in the theological dispute. The Stadtholder had the support of the army and thus was master of the situation. Oldenbarneveldt induced the province of Holland to raise a separate army, and but for Maurice's prompt action civil war would have ensued between the States of Holland and the States-General of all the provinces. The incipient rebellion was not allowed to make headway, and Oldenbarneveldt was executed as a traitor to the Republic in 1619. But the power of the merchants was strong enough to prevent national union. War with Spain was resumed in 1521, and the Stadtholder's attention was occupied with the defence of the country. Maurice died unmarried in 1625, and his brother Henry became Stadtholder. Until his death in 1647 Henry was, like his brother, constantly engaged in war with Spain.

The Dutch exercised a far greater influence over England's home and foreign policy than any other foreigners during the reigns of the early Stuarts. Spain lost strength with great rapidity after the death of Philip II. France increased in strength, but it was long before she recovered from her disastrous wars of religion. Germany was torn asunder by the Thirty Years' War, which destroyed nearly two-thirds of her population and left her a mere collection of petty disunited States. The Dutch alone seemed to be gaining from the misfortunes of their neighbours, and by imitating Dutch methods the English hoped to obtain a share of Dutch success. Until Charles I. created a strong navy a direct attack on the Dutch was certain to end in failure. Pending the creation of a navy the English tried to copy Dutch ways. The

English merchants became Calvinistic Puritans and tried to destroy the royal prerogative, their aim being that a King of England should have no more power than a Dutch Stadtholder. In the end the merchants failed, but their folly murdered their King and gave England the terrible Commonwealth.

It was not until the end of Elizabeth's reign that the friendship which united Cecil and Raleigh ceased. Both men corresponded secretly with James before his accession, and Cecil was preferred to Raleigh. Whilst Raleigh urged the King to imitate the Dutch by continuing the war with Spain and transforming England into a " State-merchant," Cecil advised peace with Spain and the continuance of the policy of developing English production. Raleigh also wished to foster English industry, but he appears to have failed to realise that a Dutch State-merchant would prove fatal to England's protective system. Defeated in his contest with Cecil, Raleigh engaged in intrigues which were pronounced treasonable. He was, however, reprieved on the scaffold, and sent to honourable confinement in the Tower. During his trial the attorney for the Crown, Sir Edward Coke, earned an unpleasant reputation by his bitter attack upon a prisoner who was fighting for life. In time the unscrupulous Crown advocate became an equally unscrupulous opponent of the Crown. In 1604 peace was made with Spain, and Cecil became Lord Salisbury.

James began his reign by trying to establish not only peace but religious toleration. He proposed a concordat with the Pope by which Catholics should enjoy toleration on condition of their being excom-

municated if they acted so as to endanger the State. When his proposal was rejected, to conciliate English Protestants James banished Catholic priests. Then followed Gunpowder Plot; and, instead of Parliament, toleration for Catholics was blown to the winds. James' first Parliament, which met in 1604, contained a majority of Puritans who still conformed to the Church of England, hoping to change it from within. James probably saw that Dutch political disunion lay behind English puritanism, since he continued Elizabeth's policy of insisting upon conformity and epitomised his views in the statement: "No bishop, no King." It is almost certain that the great majority of Englishmen would have supported the King, although the majority in Parliament opposed him. The forty-shilling franchise and the enclosures had limited the number of electors in the counties, and in the towns close corporations had so restricted the franchise that borough members represented the merchants in much the same way as delegates to the States represented the merchants of Holland. When they shelved James' scheme for the union of England and Scotland, members of the English Parliament proved that they were not out of sympathy with the Dutch particularist and mercantile policy. They had no wish to share England's trade with the Scotch.

When Church lands were confiscated and common lands enclosed, something was done to protect the poor, who had been fed by the monks. The lands were sold at low rates, subject to heavy fines if the poor were neglected by the new owners. This condition of sale was, however, systematically disregarded.

In the first year of Edward VI. Parliament passed a savage Act, punishing those who did no work for three consecutive days with branding and slavery for two years. The Act ends with a pious hope that the unemployed, who were too infirm for work, would be cared for by the localities in which they were born or were residing. Another ineffectual Act for relieving the poor was passed in 1555. In 1572 a poor-rate was first sanctioned by Parliament, and in 1597 and 1601 the system of official poor relief was definitely organised.

In 1589 an Act was passed forbidding the building of cottages without the provision of at least four acres of land to each cottage. Nevertheless, the vicious system of enclosing common lands, which had made these laws necessary, was continued. In 1607 the peasants rose in the Midland Counties; Levellers were soon busy destroying the fences which excluded the poor from the common lands; and it seemed as if Ket's rebellion would be repeated. But Government acted promptly. The revolt was suppressed, not without bloodshed and executions. Once more dragon's teeth were sown from which should spring those armed men who surrounded the scaffold at Whitehall when James' innocent son was publicly murdered.

Some attempt was apparently made in the reign of James I. to enforce the obligation which the buyers of Church lands had accepted in the reign of Henry VIII. As the holders of Church lands had incurred a penalty of 6*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* for each month of their neglect, their lands might have been forfeited to the Crown. But this was too bold a step for James to take in the

teeth of a Parliament which had made him feel its power. He therefore acceded to the request of his Parliament and remitted the penalty in 1623. This incident illustrates the difficulties which the early Stuarts had to face. They repeatedly tried to act in the interests of the people; they were thwarted at every turn by Parliaments elected by the wealthy. On the scaffold Charles I. proclaimed that he died a "martyr for the people," and he was justified in making this claim. The sufferings endured by all under the Commonwealth were required to teach the rich in England that they, too, would suffer if they neglected the English poor.

# XXII

## RELIGIOUS CONTENTIONS IN ENGLAND AND HER COLONIES

### 1604–1623

In 1606 a merchant, John Bates, refused to pay a duty on currants which had been imposed by the Crown before the accession of James I. Bates pleaded that the imposition was illegal because it had not been sanctioned by Parliament. The case was exhaustively argued in the Exchequer Chamber, and the judges, after the most careful consideration, found for the Crown. Recent research has proved that in this judgment there was no straining of the constitution or law of England. The scale of tariffs was then revised by Lord Salisbury with that moderation which was a characteristic of the Cecils. The royal revenue derived only a small benefit, but the decision was a severe blow to the Puritan merchants who wished to imitate the Dutch free-traders. The judicial decision was attacked in Parliament. That the House of Commons is not a good court of appeal was then illustrated. In order to support their case free-traders treated "De tallagio non concedendo," a paragraph written by a monkish historian, as a statute of the realm. For centuries this fiction was believed by

Englishmen. Thus Carlyle could write: "Custom-house Duties, a constant subject of quarrel between Charles and his Parliaments hitherto, had again been levied without parliamentary consent; in the teeth of old 'Tallagio non concedendo' . . ." Ignorance of this kind has led the English to label the early Stuarts as tyrants and their judges as venal sycophants.

Judges, in the seventeenth century, still regarded fees paid them by suitors as perquisites which they could accept without shame, though they could not openly defend their practice. The difficulty of settling the quarrel between King and Parliament which had begun was complicated by the absence of an impartial judicial body to whom disputes could be referred. But the royalist lawyers were no more corrupt than those who opposed the Crown. Coke was made Chief Justice of the Common Pleas in 1606. Unscrupulous and ambitious, he tried to make the court over which he presided the supreme tribunal in England. The administration of the navy had become hopelessly corrupt. A commission appointed by the Crown to reform the administration and punish offenders was obstructed in 1613 by lawyers who supported the pretensions of the Court of Common Pleas. Coke, himself, interfered in 1615 on behalf of swindlers whose victims had obtained from Chancery the justice denied them by Common Law. Coke was dismissed in 1616, and after vainly trying to regain royal favour by marrying his daughter to the brother of the King's favourite, Buckingham, the ex-judge obtained a seat in Parliament where he led the opposition to the Crown. In 1621 Coke avenged himself

on his old adversary, then Lord Chancellor Bacon, when Parliament insisted on Bacon's dismissal for having accepted money from suitors.

Salisbury, in 1610, tried to reconcile King and Parliament by making the Great Contract. This provided that the King should abandon his feudal rights in return for a permanent grant of 200,000*l.* a year, and that Parliament should assent to certain fixed tariffs whilst the Crown agreed to levy no new customs without consent of Parliament. This settlement was all but effected when, after consulting their constituents, the Commons refused to grant the 200,000*l.* In 1611 James dissolved his first Parliament, which had prevented the union of England and Scotland and the peaceful establishment of constitutional monarchy.

To Parliaments, in which the Commons claimed the right of overruling judicial decisions and exercising the functions of a court of law, Churchmen replied by asserting that kings governed by divine right and that all resistance to their authority was sinful. The King's earnest desire for peace made him advocate a compromise between these extreme theories. It also led him to believe that he could mediate between the Catholics and Protestants of the Continent who were drifting towards the terrible Thirty Years' War. To obtain influence over both sides James married his daughter, in 1613, to the Elector Palatine, leader of the German Protestants, and at the same time, in opposition to Salisbury's advice, the King commenced negotiations for the betrothal of Henry, Prince of Wales, to a daughter of the King of Spain. Both

Salisbury and the Prince of Wales died in 1512, but, regardless of Puritan feeling, James continued the negotiations with his remaining son, Charles, as the prospective bridegroom.

The large dowry promised with the Spanish bride also attracted James, since the royal income was insufficient even in times of peace. The maintenance of an efficient navy was a heavy burden, and the early Stuarts tried to do their duty in this matter in spite of their financial difficulties. For a short while Salisbury's place was filled by Robert Carr, a Scotchman, who was made Earl of Somerset. Somerset married Lady Essex, the divorced wife of the son of the Lord Essex who was executed in Elizabeth's reign. Lord and Lady Somerset were in 1616 found guilty of a murder, which was connected with the divorce proceedings. They were pardoned by the King, but were compelled to retire from court life. Somerset's place as royal favourite was filled by George Villiers, who soon afterwards was rapidly advanced to the dukedom of Buckingham. During Somerset's short ascendancy Parliament was summoned, but it refused to come to any agreement with the King, and insisted upon discussing religious questions and custom-house duties. This Parliament, called the Addled Parliament, was dissolved without transacting any business or granting supply.

In 1616 the royal finance was in such a condition that the Dutch towns which England had held since 1585 were restored for a fraction of the sum for which the Republic had pledged them. In this year also need of money led to one of the greatest tragedies of

this reign. It was almost universally believed that in Guiana, the no-man's-land between Spanish and Portuguese America, there were gold mines richer than those of Peru. In Elizabeth's reign Raleigh had attempted the colonisation of Virginia, and, after early failures, the colony of Virginia was proving itself a success. At a later period Raleigh had sought for gold in Guiana. From his prison in the Tower Raleigh asked the King's leave to be allowed once again to seek for the fabled gold mines. James consulted the ambassador of Spain and the desired permission was granted on condition that the search for the gold mines should not become a raid on Spanish settlements. The condition was broken, and whether the breach was or was not Raleigh's fault is a much debated question. In any case on Raleigh's return to England his old sentence was revived, and he was beheaded in 1618.

In 1641 Lewes Roberts was able to write of Manchester as the seat of a somewhat important cotton industry. It therefore probably began in the early years of James' reign. Spinners had not sufficient skill to spin a cotton yarn strong enough to serve as warp, but cotton brought from Smyrna to London by the Levant Company formed the woof of the fustian. It was to protect the trade of the Levant Company from their Venetian competitors that the duty on currants, to which Bates objected, was originally imposed. The warp of the fustian was of linen yarn grown and spun by the settlers who were planted in Ulster, when, after an unsuccessful rebellion, Tyrone and other Irish chiefs were driven out of Ireland in 1607. Before the end of the century Acts of Parlia-

ment were passed to stop the importation of foreign linen, whilst Irish linen was admitted duty free. This economic bond has knit Ulster to England, though, in the past the Presbyterians of the North of Ireland suffered as much from religious intolerance as Catholics in the South.

The commencement of the Thirty Years' War in Germany made the English and the Dutch anxious to end their disputes over the East Indian trade. An Anglo-Dutch commercial treaty of 1619 seemed to settle all outstanding differences, and to enable two Protestant powers to unite against the danger which threatened them. But the question at issue was too important to be peacefully settled. The massacre of Amboina followed in 1624, and in the end the sword decided whether England or Holland should be supreme in the Asiatic trade. The Dutch renewed their war with Spain in 1621, and an English Parliament was assembled, which was eager to join their old allies, and voted subsidies for the war. The King, too, was anxious to help his son-in-law, the Elector Palatine, whose lands had been conquered, but James believed that he could effect his purpose by diplomatic negotiation with Spain. In return for the subsidies voted by Parliament the King did not interfere to save Bacon when he was dismissed, but Parliament was forbidden to interfere in foreign affairs and was dissolved in 1522.

In this year 120 religious enthusiasts, who had been forced to find refuge in Holland during Elizabeth's reign, returned to Plymouth, whence they sailed in the *Mayflower* and the *Speedwell* for New England. They had previously obtained the King's promise that they

might worship as they pleased in their new home. The foundation of this colony ultimately proved far more important than the commercial successes of the Dutch which caused such heartburnings in Jacobean England. For the war, which recommenced in 1621, like all Dutch wars, was waged in the interests of trade. About this time the Dutch West India Company was formed. To it Dutch settlements in North America were transferred and a claim was made to the coast from the Chesapeake to Newfoundland. The *Mayflower* pilgrims were thus intruders in lands which both Spain and the Republic claimed. In a few years the Dutch became masters of Brazil. Admiral Hein and his sailors fought as bravely as Dutchmen did in the days of Heemskerk. But the war was costly, and the captured Spanish ships barely sufficed to pay expenses. Hein's exploits met with no recognition until in 1628 he captured a Spanish treasure fleet and the Dutch West India Company paid a 50-per-cent. dividend. Hein's astonishment at the honours which were then showered upon him shows how unable Dutch seamen were to understand the minds of their mercantile rulers.

To the Dutch colonies traders went to buy cheap and sell dear; to the English colonies settlers emigrated who intended to build homes. Joint-stock companies organised English emigration, but from the first the settlers managed their own affairs, and before long the Crown acquired the shareholders' rights. In this way New Englands grew oversea where Englishmen were able to worship as they pleased under the ægis of a Motherland which was ready to fight for them, but

left them free to govern themselves. England was amply repaid by the economic union which came from the political connexion. The colonies sent home raw materials and bought English manufactures. Experience has proved the wisdom of England's policy, but it was not evident to Englishmen in the reign of the first Stuarts. They envied the Dutch who bought cheap, sold dear, and founded no colonies in the English sense. They wondered why England should found colonies in order "to plant tobacco and puritanism only."

James' Spanish policy proved a failure. In 1623 Charles and Buckingham went in disguise to the court of Spain to woo the Spanish princess; but Philip would not agree to be neutral in the war between Protestantism and Catholicism, and there was great rejoicing in London when Charles returned empty-handed. Parliament was again summoned in 1624. Charles and Buckingham supported the popular cry for war with Spain; but the King was unwilling to abandon his Spanish policy. An inadequate supply was granted, which was more than swallowed up by the dispatch of an English force to aid the Elector Palatine. This army died miserably of parliamentary niggardliness and disease before it reached Germany. The Spanish match was broken off and Charles was betrothed to Henrietta, a Catholic, but the daughter of the ex-Huguenot tolerant Henry of Navarre. War with Spain was, however, not declared when James died in 1625 and Charles succeeded to his father's kingdom and his father's debts and difficulties.

It is universally admitted that Charles in his private

life set an excellent example to his subjects and to the other sovereigns of his time, that he was sincerely religious, and that he spared no pains in the performance of his work as King of England. It has also become customary to write that, owing to a mysterious weakness of character, Charles was the cause of the Civil War. This latter fact, although often stated as an axiomatic truth, is in reality a very debatable question. It can be urged that a stronger or more obstinate King would have been faced by rebellious subjects before Charles was, and that his character had as little to do with the Civil War as the character of the baby Prince of Orange, who was deposed by the merchant rulers of Holland two years after the execution of King Charles.

The King of England was also King of Scotland and of Ireland. In England and Scotland a large number of people had not accepted Elizabeth's compromise between Catholicism and Calvinism, and still clung to their ancient creed. These were especially numerous in the country districts. But the majority, in both kingdoms, had accepted the separation from Rome, though they were not in agreement as to what was the best national creed. Had toleration of religion been allowed it is probable that in Great Britain the mass of the population would have quietly accepted the Elizabethan compromise or have moved towards a new union with Rome. The latter alternative was greatly dreaded by the Calvinists or Puritans. These Puritans were still members of the Churches of England and Scotland. They regarded Rome and Spain as their natural enemies, and detested

everything that remained to remind them of their former connexion with the Catholic Church. They were ready to tolerate bishops and liturgies if the bishops were deprived of their lands and their power and the use of the liturgy was made optional.

In Scotland the Reformation had been closely associated with the unionist cause. In 1572 the Scotch nobles, who were as independent as the English nobles had been before the War of the Roses, insisted upon the establishment of Episcopacy in Scotland in order that the bishops might have some legal title to hand over the greater part of their revenues to the nobles to whom they owed their sees. In spite of the selfishness of the merchants in the English Parliament, who refused commercial and political union with Scotland from unwillingness to share their foreign trade with the Scotch, James induced the Scotch Parliament in 1521 to sanction the Articles of Perth, which lessened the difference between the English and Scotch Churches; but in England bishops retained their authority, whilst in Scotland their authority was overshadowed by that of the General Assembly. The English Puritans had their thoughts fixed on the Dutch Republic rather than on Scotland. They belonged for the most part to the rich English middle class, merchants and country squires. They saw, within a few miles of the English coast, the Dutch rapidly making fortunes out of trade, and doing this under an intolerant Calvinistic creed and an oligarchic government in which the power of the merchants was greater than that of the Stadtholder. English merchants wished to imitate the Dutch, and many other

Englishmen sympathised with their wish. Whatever may have been true of the bulk of the English, those who had the franchise were largely Puritan.

There was in Ireland an overwhelming majority of Catholics. The penal laws nominally existed in Ireland as well as Great Britain, but they could not be enforced, and the Irish Parliament contained as many or even more Catholics than Protestants. In France the toleration of religion granted by the Edict of Nantes had put an end to civil strife. Even when the King of France broke the agreement in certain respects there was no general rising, but isolated revolts, as at La Rochelle. It was, therefore, only natural that the Stuarts wished to unite their kingdoms by religious toleration, and that the Puritans of Parliament opposed a policy which they thought would be fatal to their party and their power.

In their oversea dominions the early Stuarts had an opportunity of showing England the benefits of their policy. To them North America owes the foundation of its free institutions and religious toleration. Virginia and other colonies were created by chartered companies whose shares were largely held by members of the two Houses of Parliament. The Crown retained the right of rescinding these charters if the companies failed to govern wisely. The Virginia Company soon discovered that their early hope of large dividends from Virginian gold mines was a dream which could never be realised. To obtain dividends for their shareholders the merchants oppressed the settlers, whose complaints were carried to England. Fearing that James would rescind their charter if there was no

reform, the merchants in 1619 granted a charter to the settlers by which they were allowed self-government under governors appointed by the company. Under this government the settlers devoted themselves to the cultivation of tobacco with great success. Suddenly, in 1622, the colonists were attacked by Indians and all but exterminated. Then the settlers appealed to their King for protection. In the last year of James' reign the Virginia Company was dissolved and Virginia became the first self-governing colony under the Crown. Her staple product, tobacco, was then also protected. No tobacco, other than Virginian, was allowed to enter England or Ireland, and the growing of tobacco in England or Ireland was forbidden.

In 1620, just before the *Mayflower* carried the pilgrims to New England, James incorporated the New England Company. The headquarters of this company was Plymouth, and it replaced an older West of England Company which had unsuccessfully competed with the London Company in the colonisation of Virginia. Although Massachusetts was peopled by Puritans, who in England were undermining the royal power, Charles I. gave self-government to the colony in 1629. In their new home the Puritans were able to establish a theocracy in defiance of their charter, which plainly gave legislative power to the whole body of the freemen. When a body of settlers unconnected with the Church of England left Massachusetts to found a colony in Rhode Island, where they could have democratic government and freedom of conscience, they received from Charles a patent protecting

them from Puritan oppression. In New England those who stood for freedom and toleration invariably looked to the King of England.

The creation of the self-governing colony of Maryland is perhaps the most striking instance of Charles' desire for religious toleration. This was severed from the loyal colony of Virginia to form a place of refuge for English Catholics when Parliament insisted on their persecution. Not even in Rhode Island was there such perfect freedom from religious bigotry as in Maryland until England had lost her King. Then for a short while Puritans who had been invited to Maryland by their Catholic fellow-subjects extinguished religious freedom by force of arms. Maryland regained her freedom when royalty was restored in England.

During the last few years of Elizabeth's reign, although the Catholics were not actively persecuted in Ireland, a subtle attempt was made to impoverish the native Irish by the issue of base coin. This policy was, however, abandoned immediately after the accession of James I. Sir Arthur Chichester was appointed Lord Deputy in 1604. At first he attempted to force the Irish Catholics to obey the law and attend services in the Protestant churches; but, when he found that persecution was likely to end in civil war, Chichester reverted to the old system of practical toleration. The old Irish land system was socialistic. Land was held by an individual for life only. When the holder of land died the chief of his clan had power to divide it between the members of the clan. Chichester attempted, at first with apparent success, to substitute the English freehold system for the Irish tenure.

This success was probably due to the decision of the English Privy Council that the new system should not be made an excuse for alienating land from the Irish to English settlers, but that the freeholders should be Irish.

The introduction of the English land system struck a fatal blow at the independence of the chiefs of the Irish clans. A quarrel ensued between an Ulster chieftain and his vassal. They were finally summoned to argue their case in London. This invitation was interpreted by the chieftain as an English attempt to secure his person, and he and a fellow chief of the North fled from Ireland never to return. Nevertheless their departure was followed by an insurrection in Ulster which was suppressed without much difficulty. This revolt was followed by wholesale confiscation of land and the planting in Ulster of settlers from England and Scotland.

The English thought that the annexation of Ulster had broken the power of the Irish Catholics; but they found that it had driven the loyal Catholics of Anglo-Norman descent into alliance with the native Irish. The penal laws against Catholics could not be enforced, although attempts were made not only to enforce them but to increase their severity. The recall of Chichester in 1615 was followed by plantations in various parts of Ireland. Under the new English land laws it was easy to find pretexts for dispossessing Irish landowners. Thus, during the reign of James I., discontent in Ireland increased.

# XXIII

## CAUSES WHICH LED TO CIVIL WAR

### 1623–1629

BEFORE his father's death Charles had gained great popularity with Parliament by opposing the Spanish alliance. Buckingham shared this popularity and Charles made him his chief adviser, but their short-lived popularity vanished when Charles became King. This was inevitable. Parliament wished to gain for itself the same control over home and foreign affairs as the Dutch States-General possessed. On the other hand the King, from motives which were not altogether selfish, objected to becoming a mere Stadtholder. For whilst Parliament was formulating its extensive claim it was proclaiming its incompetence to direct foreign affairs or adequately consider the interest of English workers.

The factor which dominated the whole political situation was the overwhelming sea power of the Dutch. They claimed and exercised the right of fishing off the coasts of England as if they belonged to the Republic. When James prohibited foreigners from fishing in English waters, hoping to develop an English industry, the Dutch sent their fishing fleet with an armed escort, and the English had to submit. There

was only one remedy for this trouble, the creation of a strong navy. Both James and Charles did all they could to create this navy, but their efforts were largely neutralised by Parliament's refusal to grant the necessary funds. An alliance with the Dutch and a maritime struggle with Spain would have led to the same result as in Elizabeth's reign. England would have shared in the fighting, and the Dutch would have monopolised the rewards of a successful war. Yet this was the course advocated by Parliament.

The royal policy was a close alliance with France and friendship with the Dutch until the English navy was built. As a condition of the alliance the French demanded that English Catholics should enjoy the same freedom from persecution as French Protestants enjoyed in France. Just before his death James signed the required agreement with Louis XIII., and the penal laws were suspended. In 1625 Charles was married by proxy to the French King's sister Henrietta, who landed in England a week before Charles' first Parliament met. Nine months earlier Charles and Buckingham had prevailed upon James to yield to the wishes of Parliament and break with Spain. In return Parliament presented the King with a colossal programme for the war and an inadequate sum of money. Six months had nearly elapsed since an English force was despatched under Mansfield to make its way to Germany through the Netherlands. Owing to the poverty of the Crown this force was dying miserably of starvation and disease when Charles' first Parliament met.

Charles naturally asked Parliament for money that

he might carry out the Parliamentary programme. In reply a ridiculously insufficient supply was voted, and heedless of the sufferings of the English soldiers in the Netherlands, Parliament began to discuss grievances. One grievance was the suspension of the penal laws; another was that a clergyman named Montague had ventured to publish a book advocating doctrines held to-day by moderate high Churchmen, and pleading that Catholics as well as Protestants were members of the Church of Christ. Montague urged that Catholics were "corrupt and unsound in the highest degree, but not utterly apostate." Charles protected Montague from an impeachment threatened by the Commons; but the King had to promise to persecute Catholics. Even this concession failed to induce the Commons to grant supply, and in 1625 Parliament was dissolved.

Tunnage and poundage, in other words customs duties, included the export duties on English products (once chiefly raw wool, by this time manufactured cloth) and the impositions on imported goods which the Crown levied in virtue of its right to regulate foreign trade. At the commencement of a reign, tunnage and poundage were usually granted to the King for life. The grant was a renewal of the agreement made with Edward I. when that king surrendered his right of taking an arbitrary prise from England's exports. It was practically a charter for English producers, and no English king had ever refused to ratify this ancient compact. But Charles' first Parliament shelved a Bill which would have sanctioned tunnage and poundage for one year only.

The shelving of this Bill was a declaration of war. From the reign of William I. until James' reign the Crown lands had been steadily alienated, and Charles could only count on a slender income from this source. James had levied certain feudal aids, but he was obliged to make a moderate use of this ancient prerogative. After his reign no king ventured to claim these aids. The sale of baronetcies, which replaced these aids, was little liked, and monopolies had been strictly limited in 1624. If Charles had abandoned his right to levy customs duties he would have become not a constitutional monarch relying on his people for support, but a puppet in the hands of his merchants. The merchants had good reasons for wishing to reduce the royal power to complete insignificance. Heavy fines levied on wealthy merchants did not increase their affection for the King.

The great trading companies existed in virtue of charters granted by the King. What the King gave, the King could take away. Thus at the beginning of James' reign, when there was an outcry against trading monopolies, the Levant Company had to surrender its charter, and a company formed to trade with Spain and Portugal died after one year's existence. When the attack on monopolist companies failed in the Parliament of 1604 the Levant Company regained its charter, and many new companies were founded. The companies during James' reign strengthened their influence over Parliament by converting associations of merchants into joint stock companies. A very large number of the wealthy, who alone had votes, were interested on the side of the merchants. Before its

suppression in 1624 the stock of the Virginia Company was held by a thousand adventurers, whilst the number of electors in England was only about 160,000. In 1604, when trading monopolies only were attacked, scarce forty votes in the Commons were in favour of the companies. In 1624, when other monopolies were abolished, trading companies were excepted. This illustrates the change in parliamentary feeling which had taken place during the reign of James I.

The suppression of the Virginia Company at the request of the settlers was not the only grievance of which stockholders had to complain. When Parliament tried to interfere on behalf of the Virginia Company, and James took the matter into his own hands, there were those who muttered "that any other business might in the same way be taken out of the hands of Parliament." The Dutch seemed to be about to found a great empire in Brazil. Their West India Company was bidding fair to be as great a success as the Dutch East India Company. English merchants could contrast this with the strong action taken by James in 1620 to prevent an English company from provoking a war with Spain by founding colonies on the Amazon. In the East, as in the West, the hopes built on the agreement with the Dutch in 1619 were shattered by the massacre at Amboina in 1622, and England dared not provoke the Dutch navy. It appeared to be England's fate to feed on crumbs which fell from the Dutchman's table, and even these crumbs might be swept away if a firm Anglo-Dutch alliance was not promptly formed. Hence Parliament was indifferent when its action against Catholics undermined the Anglo-

French alliance, and Charles, too, found in fines imposed on Catholics some slight relief from his financial troubles.

Just before James' death arrangements were made for the despatch of a great fleet to Spain. The Dutch were to lend England twenty ships, and in order to encourage the French to make the attack, Buckingham promised to lend these and twenty other English ships to the King of France. Before the fleet was ready the Huguenots of La Rochelle were in revolt because Louis had failed to destroy a fort which commanded the harbour. In 1625 Richelieu, the great French minister, persuaded Buckingham that peace was about to be made with the Huguenots, and one English naval ship with six merchantmen were lent to France. They were then manned by Frenchmen and used against the Huguenots. This happened a few weeks after the dissolution of Parliament, and was used to inflame public opinion in England against the King's adviser, Buckingham. A little more than six weeks later an expedition to Spain proved a failure owing to the treasonable conduct of the merchantmen attached to the fleet. This also became a grievance.

Urgent need of money forced Charles to summon his second Parliament in 1626. He was at this time trying to pledge the crown jewels with the merchants of Amsterdam. Four sub-committees were soon hard at work discussing grievances. The failure of the Spanish expedition, due to inadequate parliamentary supply and the disaffection of the merchants, was one grievance, the friction with France caused primarily by Parliament's insistence on the persecution of

Catholics was another. Montague's pamphlet and the fact that Buckingham controlled the Admiralty and was also Master of the Horse and Warden of the Cinque Ports engaged the attention of the Commons. Last, but probably not least, Buckingham had dared to demand and obtain from the East India Company certain royal dues on ships which had been captured in the East. An attack on Buckingham's administration was being prepared when Charles appealed to Parliament to give him supply so that the grievances might be prevented and redressed. Supply was, however, not granted, and the Commons threatened to call the Custom House officers to account unless the King surrendered his prerogative by asking Parliament for tunnage and poundage. The discord between Charles and his Parliament increased. The Commons impeached Buckingham, and members used language which threatened the King's authority and the life of his minister. Two of the more violent members were imprisoned and then released. To end an impossible situation Parliament was dissolved in June 1626.

The action of Parliament against toleration of Catholics had undermined the Anglo-French alliance, and whilst Parliament was sitting England and France were on the verge of war. These strained relations were somewhat inconsistently made one of Parliament's many grievances. French ships were arrested for carrying contraband of war to the Spanish. This difficulty might have been overcome, but in the hope of conciliating his Puritan subjects, Charles prevented English Catholics from attending Mass at the French

embassy. At every turn Charles was confronted by the insuperable difficulty of pleasing both his Puritan subjects and his Catholic French allies. To maintain England's position a strong navy was needed, but Parliament would not grant supply. At war with Spain and drifting into war with France, Charles demanded free gifts and forced loans, thus appealing "from a faction to the body of the nation." In this matter the King was acting illegally, and the judges refused to support him. When the Chief Justice was replaced by one whom the King believed to be more pliable, Charles refrained from asking his judges to reverse their decision. Those who refused to contribute to the loan were imprisoned. An application was made for a writ of *habeas corpus*, which the Crown answered by pleading that there were reasons of State preventing the immediate disclosure of the cause for which the arrests had been made. The judges found that this answer was a good one in the particular case which had been submitted to them. There were obviously many precedents in support of this judicial decision. Ship money was levied in the maritime counties, and precedents for this tax were so clear that it could not be resisted. The building of a royal navy began, and England was soon independent of the merchant ships which had failed her in time of need.

To satisfy the Puritans Charles sent his wife's French attendants back to France. English merchantmen were seized by the French, and the merchants clamoured for redress. A fleet was prepared which swept the French from the sea and sailed to relieve La Rochelle. Again an English expedition intended

to help foreign Protestants was wrecked by the Puritans of England. On their way to the coast the soldiers, lacking pay or provisions, were forced to live on the farmers with whom they were billeted. This became a grievance. Buckingham led the expedition, which all but proved a great success. Its ultimate failure and the loss of many English lives were undoubtedly due to lack of support from England. No one has ventured to suggest that Charles failed to aid Buckingham for any other reason than poverty. To obtain money Parliament was summoned in 1628.

The leader of Charles' second Parliament was Eliot, but in the third Parliament Wentworth took the lead. Under their new leader the Commons adopted a more conciliatory attitude. The Petition of Right obtained the royal assent amidst universal rejoicing. The King agreed that "no man hereafter be compelled to make or yield any gift, loan, benevolence, tax or such like charge without common consent by Act of Parliament," that arbitrary imprisonment should cease, and that there should be no more billeting of soldiers or proclamations of martial law. Three hundred and fifty thousand pounds were then granted to the King, and constitutional monarchy might have begun in England but for Eliot and the Puritans. This was not the ending they had in view.

Two days after the King had assented to the Petition of Right a clergyman named Manwaring was impeached by Pym on behalf of the Commons. Manwaring's offence was that he had preached in favour of the King and had published his sermon after obtaining the royal licence. The Lords inflicted a severe

sentence and Charles pardoned the criminal. Parliament as well as the King denied the right of free speech to opponents. The attack on Buckingham was renewed; this time by way of a remonstrance to the King. Ballads were circulated denouncing the King's minister as luxurious, incompetent, and immoral. The effect was soon seen in the murder of a Dr. Lambe, a quack doctor, who had been consulted by Buckingham. The London mob, as they battered their victim to death, said that, if Buckingham had been present, "they would have minced his flesh, and have had every one a bit of him." Then the Commons turned their attention to tunnage and poundage and were promptly prorogued.

Eighteen years earlier when the Great Contract was discussed 200,000*l.* a year was considered a fair equivalent for the King's prerogative of taxation. All feudal dues and other taxes were abolished by the Petition of Right in return for one payment of 350,000*l.* "It is as certain as anything can well be that, either because they did not wish to enhance the difficulty of obtaining a satisfactory answer from the King, or because they expected to gain their object in another way, the Commons never had any intention to include the question of tunnage and poundage in the Petition of Right." The Customs duties amounted each year to about half the 350,000*l.* voted by the Commons. It is, therefore, absurd to suppose that the King would have surrendered this annual income and limited his prerogative for so paltry a sum. Yet the Commons, within a few days of the royal assent to the Petition of Right, claimed that the word tax in the

petition meant tariff. When the Commons adopted this attitude Wentworth accepted a peerage and left the House which he had ceased to direct.

Whilst Parliament was discussing grievances the citizens of La Rochelle were dying of starvation. With the money voted by Parliament an English fleet was hastily prepared, and Buckingham was on the eve of sailing in command of the expedition when he was murdered at Portsmouth. The murderer was treated as a hero, and the fleet sailed under a new commander. Off La Rochelle the royal ships were unable to come to close quarters owing to their draught, and the pressed merchantmen refused to obey orders. In October 1628 La Rochelle surrendered. Six months later peace was made with France and in 1630 with Spain.

The second session of Parliament in 1629 was made duller by the murder of Buckingham, but there were still many grievances, religion and the Customs were the chief. In this Parliament Cromwell delivered his first speech. He mentioned briefly that some twelve years before 1629 a clergyman preached a sermon which a Puritan preacher thought was in favour of papacy. Cromwell's Puritan friend preached the next sermon, and, in spite of a warning from the bishop, denounced his brother in Christ. Thereupon the bishop reprimanded the Puritan. Here was clearly a member who had a genius for discovering grievances and who might rise. The debates on religion turned on details which to-day seem too trivial to engage the attention of sensible men, but they must have embittered the life of the King. On tunnage and poundage the views of the members were quite clear. Just

before Parliament was dissolved its deliberations were summed up in the following resolutions: "Whosoever shall bring in innovation in religion, or by favour seek to extend or introduce Popery or Arminianism, or other opinions disagreeing from the true and orthodox Church, shall be reputed a capital enemy to this kingdom and commonwealth. Whosoever shall counsel or advise the taking and levying of tunnage and poundage, not being granted by Parliament, or shall be an actor or an instrument therein, shall be likewise reputed an innovator in the government, and a capital enemy to this kingdom and commonwealth. If any merchant or other person whatsoever shall voluntarily yield or pay the said subsidies of tunnage and poundage not being granted by Parliament, he shall likewise be reputed a betrayer of the liberty of England, and an enemy to the same." This was Charles' reward for assenting to the Petition of Right. It was eleven years before Parliament again assembled.

The history of France in the seventeenth century forms a sharp contrast with that of England and Holland. The members of the Commons in the French States-General were largely elected by the people, or Third Estate, and not by a privileged class. In many communes there was manhood suffrage. The French people had, therefore, an articulate voice, which the English and the Dutch did not possess. They recognised in the royal power the factor which not only made for national unity but stood between the poor, not long emancipated from serfdom, and rich magnates, who were ready to take advantage of the ignorance and weakness of the mass of the people.

The Third Estate was the chief support of the King in the long struggle which reduced the feudal princes to subordination to the central power of the Crown. In France doctrines of the Reformation were at first embraced by the artisans and the Third Estate advocated religious toleration. The attitude of the Third Estate changed when aristocrats accepted Protestantism and tried to use it as a means of undermining the royal power. But, whilst the majority of the French people opposed Protestantism, they had no sympathy with the anti-nationalism of the Guises. They welcomed the extension of the King's authority in the reign of Henry IV. Under this King France accepted the principle of religious toleration; the movement in favour of union with Spain was crushed; and, taught by their sufferings in the civil wars, the French learned to value their King as the factor which made for national union and national strength.

Henry IV. repaid his subjects by fostering home industry and colonial enterprise. The policy he commenced was carried on by his successors under the guidance of Richelieu, Mazarin, and Colbert. England, the most dangerous rival of the French, was handicapped by the fight between King and Parliament. When the struggle was over in England, she was faced by a vigorous producing nation with whom she had to fight for more than a century for sea power and world empire. It is impossible to say what the issue of this struggle would have been had Louis XIV. continued Henry's policy of religious toleration and Louis' descendants been faithful to the protective system perfected by Colbert. In 1614 the Third

Estate of France, the one articulate voice of the democracy in Western Europe, begged the King to proclaim as the fundamental law of France that he was an absolute monarch and that there was no reason, spiritual or temporal, which could justify resistance to his will. After this act of abdication the States-General were not again summoned until 1789. In 1616 Richelieu began his political career as adviser to the Queen Dowager, who was acting as Regent for Louis XIII.

One of Richelieu's services to France was the creation of a central admiralty to replace the independent provincial admiralties. Whilst England engaged in a suicidal civil war France was engaged in the problem of developing production, founding colonies, and creating the marine which should bind the colonist to the home producer. The conquest of the Huguenot seaport of La Rochelle made it certain that the New France which was being founded in Canada should be Catholic and loyal. The conduct of the Jesuit missionaries aided Richelieu in this matter. The English settlers exterminated the natives and Dutchmen sold firearms to the Mohawks to be used against Catholic Christian tribes. Both the English and the Dutch bought and sold African slaves. But the Canadians kept themselves free from the taint of slavery, and, in advance of the French settler, missionaries taught the Indians the Christian faith and built chapels, hospitals, and schools in which Indians and Frenchmen were treated as brothers in Christ. Loyalty, freedom, and piety were the characteristics of Canada from the very first.

The growth of French influence in North America became in time a serious danger to England's colonies. North America might have been French-speaking to-day had the French been true to the principles which guided them in the seventeenth century. The inevitable struggle between two strong nations for supremacy in North America was, after many years of fighting, decided in favour of the English more by the inability of the French to understand the value of Canada than by the power of the sword. But for Charles' early Parliaments this struggle need never have occurred. When Buckingham was failing to relieve La Rochelle the English in America were capturing French settlements, and before the end of the war the French flag almost ceased to wave in Canada. As one of the conditions of the peace which the opposition of Parliament forced Charles to make with France, Quebec and other Canadian settlements were restored to the French. Not until 1760, when the French were accepting the doctrines of *laisser-faire*, was Canada again part of the British Empire. It is difficult to over-estimate the gain to France and the loss to England of the decades of English disloyalty, of civil war, and of Cromwell's military usurpation.

## XXIV

### CONDITION OF THE PEOPLE UNDER CHARLES I.

1625–1636

DURING the Reformation in Scotland the nobles had seized the revenues of the Church. Scotch bishops and clergy depended on aristocratic paymasters for their stipends. James I. did something to remedy this grievance by securing a permanent income for the clergy. The noble owner of tithe was still, however, able to oppress the tiller of the soil by compelling him "to keep his harvest ungarnered till it pleased the tithe owner to take possession of his share." To remedy this and other evils, in 1625 Charles issued an Act of Revocation by which the mass of Church property in the hands of laymen was re-annexed to the Crown, on the ground of technical flaws in the original concessions. At the same time the King issued a proclamation explaining that he did not intend to take full advantage of the Act. This was followed by an arrangement which allowed farmers to exchange tithe for a rent-charge or extinguish tithe by paying nine years' purchase. Church lands were left in the hands of the nobles in return for certain payments to the King. This "wise and beneficent reform gave the nobles a legal title to their lands in return for their payments

to the Crown; the poorer clergy received increased stipends; the King was enabled to re-endow bishops; and the farmers could reap their harvests in peace. But the nobles objected to a measure which deprived them of some of the wealth which came from the stolen lands, and they feared that more drastic measures would be taken against them at some future time."

A conciliatory policy was adopted in Ireland. Between 1626 and 1629, after much discussion, an arrangement was made by which a standing army was raised and paid for by the Irish in return for concessions or Graces granted by the Crown. These Graces abolished many, but not all, the Catholic grievances, gave landowners a title to lands which had been in private hands for sixty years, and promised the native chiefs of Connaught, where the English land system had not been established, a confirmation of their estates in the following year. In Monaghan, Catholic priests tried to take possession of their confiscated churches; but there is no reason to assume that the policy of conciliation would not have proved a success had it been adhered to. A loyal Irish army might well have answered the hopes of its creators by defending Ireland from Spanish intrigues and attacks. Land-grabbing wrecked this hopeful scheme.

The sept of the Byrnes held land in Wicklow which officials in Dublin, including Lord Deputy Falkland, coveted. The Byrnes had been guilty of turbulence and outrages in the reign of Elizabeth; but, after the accession of James, the chief of the Byrnes had induced his sept to settle down to a regular life. Nevertheless, in 1623 Falkland proposed to plant Wicklow. This

proposal was vetoed by the English Government. In 1625 Falkland reported that he had discovered a conspiracy in which the Byrnes were involved. Again the English Government forbade the plantation. Three years later the chief of the Byrnes and his two sons were arrested. Before their trial Charles intervened. A Commission was appointed to sift the evidence against the Byrnes, which reported that the Byrnes, instead of being conspirators, were themselves the victims of an infamous conspiracy. Falkland resigned, and Viscount Wentworth, who had led the opposition to the King in Charles' third Parliament, became Lord Deputy of Ireland.

The action of Parliament, after Charles' acceptance of the Petition of Right, caused many moderate parliamentarians to modify their views. Those who sought to establish constitutional monarchy left a party which aimed at making Parliament supreme and reducing the power of the King to that of a Stadtholder. Prominent amongst these new royalists was Wentworth, a commoner of ample fortune, like his colleague, Hampden, who with Wentworth and others had been imprisoned for resisting the illegal forced loan. Wentworth's action was not inconsistent. He had objected to an illegality which would have increased the prerogative of the Crown. When the King admitted his error by accepting the Petition of Right, Wentworth, not inconsistently, objected to the attempt to coerce the King into abandoning his legal right to tunnage and poundage, without which the Crown could neither defend England from a foreign foe nor maintain law and order in the British Isles.

Wentworth became Viscount Wentworth and Lord President of the North. In counties where the tradition of feudal independence still lingered, Lord Wentworth tried to establish the central authority of the Crown, not without making enemies, but without exciting serious opposition. Having proved his capacity in the Northern Counties, Wentworth was sent to Ireland in 1633 to solve the problem which had baffled his predecessors in the office of Lord Deputy.

Another parliamentarian, Noy, was made Attorney-General in 1631. He devoted himself to discovering in old records precedents by means of which the Crown could obtain the national revenue which Parliament declined to grant. It was not necessary to invent statutes, such as "De Tallagio non concedendo," to prove that the rich had stolen from the King and nation vast areas of forest lands. Thus, in 1634, the descendants of those who had stolen forest lands were forced to pay for titles to their estates. Then land-owning magnates united with mercantile magnates, and, like his ancestor, Edward II., Charles paid with his life for his attack on those who held the stolen lands.

In 1633 Charles was crowned at Holyrood after entering Edinburgh "amidst a storm of loyal welcome." But the Scotch nobles had not been idle. Whilst the King of Scotland held his court near London, then far distant from Scotland, his Scotch nobles, with little fear of royal interference, could influence public opinion in Scotland and thus secure their hold over the old Church lands. To have servants in whom he could trust, Charles had given to the Scotch bishops high positions in the government of Scotland. Not

unnaturally the nobles feared that the bishops would use their power to upset the compromise which sanctioned the alienation of Church lands. The revival of the royal claim to the forests must have filled the Scotch nobles with forebodings. If ancient titles to land could be disregarded where the land had been stolen, there was little reason to hope that their titles would be respected if an inquiry was called for. Thus discontent soon developed into a storm which shattered the power of the Crown.

In England, Scotland, and Ireland political and economic quarrels were disguised. Naked and unashamed they would have been unable to involve three kingdoms in civil war; but when those who were about to draw the sword for their private interests represented themselves as religious enthusiasts they were able to enlist in their ranks some of the noblest minds. Milton, after much hesitation, definitely adopted the cause of Parliament; but against lofty thinkers such as Milton can be set men like George Herbert and Nicholas Ferrar, who worshipped God in the beauty of holiness and followed their King with unswerving loyalty. Modern Englishmen, nauseated by the invective which Whig historians have poured upon Charles' faithful servants, can turn for relief to the "Memorials" of the parliamentarian lawyer, Whitelock, who served Cromwell during his usurpation and was largely responsible for the judicial murder of Strafford, once the Wentworth who helped to frame the Petition of Right. In the interests of his cause Whitelock had slain his enemy, but he was too generous to revile a fallen foe. After describing the scene on the scaffold,

Whitelock wrote : " Thus fell this Noble Earl, who for his natural Parts and Abilities, and for improvement of knowledge by experience, in the greatest Affairs, for wisdom, faithfulness, and gallantry of mind, hath left few behind him, that may be ranked with him."

Chief amongst those who have suffered at the hands of Whig historians stands Laud, Bishop of London in 1628, and Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633, who was Charles' spiritual and political guide during the King's personal reign. Laud and Wentworth were responsible for the royal policy to which they gave the name " Thorough." They shared the honour of martyrdom by Act of Parliament, after their enemies had vainly tried to find a legal pretext for killing them. Briefly, " Thorough " consisted in administering the law with absolute fairness, allowing the rich no privileges denied to the poor, in substituting for the Stuart policy of religious toleration the repression of sedition which was thinly veiled under puritanism, and in rigid economy at home so that England might make her power felt abroad whilst the King lived of his own until such time as Parliament should agree with the King as to their respective rights. In 1629 peace was signed with France and Spain, and under Charles' personal rule England enjoyed such prosperity that, but for the Irish and the Scotch, " Thorough " might well have been a success.

In Ireland " Thorough " partially failed because Wentworth could not divest himself of English prejudices. He was unable to regard the native Catholics other than as a conquered people who were not entitled to the even-handed justice which was necessary for the

success of the new policy. When the money required for the Irish army was granted, no more Irish Parliaments were summoned, and the promise to the natives in Connaught was not fulfilled. The grants had been made for three years, and this period was about to expire when Wentworth landed in Ireland. From the Irish Council and the Catholic landowners he obtained a prolongation of the Irish contribution for a year. Advantage was then taken of the strife between Catholic and Protestant in the Irish Parliament of 1634, and Wentworth obtained the money he required, whilst he omitted from the Graces the confirmation of estates with sixty years' title and refused to fulfil the compact with the landowners of Connaught. "Thorough" in Ireland meant the establishment of the King's authority and of English rule in every province; hence Wentworth claimed Connaught for the Crown and proceeded to plant it with settlers. This alone would not have stirred England. All English parties regarded the native Irish as a conquered race, and cared little when promises to the Irish were broken and Irish lands were given to English settlers.

But the establishment of royal authority in Ireland involved disputes with the English lords, and this was remembered against Wentworth. When Ulster was planted, the London companies had obtained the county of Londonderry on certain conditions which they had not fulfilled. The Star Chamber forfeited these lands and imposed a heavy fine in 1635. Henceforward Wentworth could count upon the hostility of the merchants of London. A small, but well paid

and efficient, army was raised in Ireland. Supported by this disciplined force Wentworth was able to carry out his policy in the teeth of the opposition of the magnates. The established Church in Ireland had become a scandal. Education and spiritual work were neglected. As in Scotland, the property of the Church was passing into the hands of wealthy laymen, who allowed church buildings to decay, and paid small stipends to ministers. When Wentworth " arrived in Ireland he found that one of the Dublin churches had served his predecessor for a stable, that a second had been converted into a dwelling-house, and that the choir of a third was used as a tennis-court. The vaults underneath Christ Church were let out as alehouses and tobacco shops. In the choir above, the communion table, standing in the midst of the congregation, had become an ordinary seat for maids and apprentices." Since this was the condition of the Church in Dublin it is not surprising that Catholicism and Presbyterianism were the principal spiritual forces in Ireland. Wentworth did excellent service to religion by reforming the Church: he marred his good work by insisting upon conformity to the established faith.

In Wentworth's economic policy there was the same success and failure. The Irish Sea was infested by privateers flying the Spanish flag and " pirates in all but name." Wentworth fitted out ships and cleared the sea. He imported flax seed, and not only started the linen industry of Ulster, but was one of the founders of the Lancashire cotton industry. At first, English cotton spinners were unable to spin a cotton thread

strong enough to serve as warp. In 1641 Lewes Roberts wrote, "the town of Manchester buys the linen yarn of the Irish in great quantity, and, weaving it, returns the same again in linen into Ireland to sell. Neither does her industry rest here, for they buy cotton-wool in London that comes first from Cyprus and Smyrna, and work the same into fustians, vermilions, dimities, &c., which they return to London, where they are sold, and from thence, not seldom, are sent into such foreign parts where the first materials may be more easily had for that manufacture."

Wentworth wished to establish in Ireland not only the growing of flax and the spinning of yarn but the final weaving of linen cloth. When he went to London in 1636 to answer accusations brought against him by discontented Irish magnates, he told the Council that he had imported Dutch weavers as well as Dutch flax seed, and that there were six or seven looms at work in Ulster. But, too mindful of English interests, Wentworth discouraged the Irish woollen industry. Thus Ulster was endowed with agriculture and manufactures, whilst the other provinces were forced to subsist on agriculture alone. After the Commonwealth this became the settled policy of England. State aid was given to the linen industry of Ulster. The Lancashire fustian industry developed into the Lancashire cotton industry, and the making of linen was left to the Irish of Ulster. In other parts of Ireland manufactures were strangled in the interests of English manufacturers. Both Catholics and Presbyterians were persecuted, but the economic bond kept Ulster loyal to England whilst the Catholics of the other province became

England's foes. But all this was not foreseen in Wentworth's time. He had done one great service in lessening the power of the magnates, and the poor were glad because the power of the Crown stood between them and oppression. In the summer of 1637 Wentworth was greeted with every mark of affection when he paid a visit to the South of Ireland.

In England Archbishop Laud was doing much the same work as Wentworth in Ireland. Abbot, his predecessor in the see of Canterbury, had been a Puritan Calvinist, who "considered Christian religion no otherwise than as it abhorred and reviled Popery, and valued those men most who did that most furiously." "The remissness of Abbot, and of other bishops by his example, had introduced, or at least connived at a negligence, that gave great scandal to the Church, and no doubt offended very many pious men. The people took so little care of the churches, and the parsons as little of the chancels, that instead of beautifying them or adorning them in any degree, they rarely provided against the falling of many of their churches, and suffered them at least to be kept so indecently and slovenly that they would not have endured it in the ordinary offices of their own houses; the rain and the wind to infest them, and the Sacraments themselves to be administered where the people had most mind to receive them." The central aisle of St. Paul's Cathedral was used as a common thoroughfare and called Paul's Walk. Business men used the cathedral as a clubroom and children as a playground. The clergy complained that their services in the choir could not be heard owing to the noise in the nave. In the

adjacent church of St. Gregory the Communion table had been moved from the east end to the nave and merchants sat on it and used it as a writing-table.

Strange as it seems to modern Englishmen, accustomed to see churches and chapels treated with reverence, there were earnest and godly men who believed that spiritual religion was increased by the desecration of houses of prayer. Hatred of Rome drove them to extremes which very few would now defend. Laud fully shared the Puritan dislike of the papacy; he had no love for Calvin's harsh creed, but he was as zealous for spiritual religion as the holiest Puritan. Left to themselves there is no reason why the two parties in the Church of England should not have agreed to differ as high and low Churchmen do to-day. Both Laud's followers and the Puritans were in favour of a united Church of England. Separatists, few in number and disliked by both parties, consisted largely of foreign immigrants who were allowed to worship in England as they had been accustomed to worship in their foreign homes. But there were those who had unworthy reasons for objecting to unity and discipline in the Church. Religious anarchy allowed them to steal funds held in trust for religious or educational purposes. The Church still owned much land which could be plundered if anarchy increased. When, as Bishop of London, Laud removed the Communion tables to the east end of churches and surrounded them with rails to protect them from profanation by men and stray dogs he had to face strenuous opposition.

The merchants of London made use of Puritan preachers to further their political aims. Tithes,

which supported the London clergy, were reduced to a mere pittance by fraudulent undervaluation; on the other hand, funds were collected to endow lectureships in London and provincial churches. These lecturers held offices at the pleasure of their paymasters. They could sit in the vestry during the service until the time came for them to enter the pulpit and denounce the Church which they were nominally serving. Landlords in the country obtained the same power over the clergy as money lords in the towns. The parish priests, who had once been able to champion the cause of the poor against oppressors and enclosers, now spoke at the risk of losing their incomes. Laud did much to re-establish the independence of the clergy. The poor again had those who could plead their cause, and stealers of national or ecclesiastical property were called to account.

In an island like England fishing ought to have flourished; but, deprived of protection in 1435, it remained in a sickly condition in spite of spasmodic efforts to revive it. In 1601 Sir John Keymer wrote: "There is more wealth raised out of herrings and other fish in his Majesty's seas by the neighbouring nations in one year than the King of Spain hath from the Indies in four. There are 20,000 ships and other vessels, and about 400,000 people thus set on work by sea and land, and maintained only by fishing upon the coast of England, Scotland, and Ireland." He said that before arriving at this conclusion "he traced the countries twice over from town to town, and from thence along his Majesty's sea coasts of England, Scotland, and Ireland." The Dutch did most of this

fishing, and their sea-power was so great that England had to submit to the Dutch as Denmark had formerly submitted to the Hanse League. James I. tried to compel Dutch fishermen to pay for the privilege of using English waters; but he abandoned the attempt when the Dutch fishing fleet was escorted by Dutch warships. No reparation could be obtained for the massacre of English traders by the Dutch at Amboina, although the claim was pressed at intervals after 1624.

Both the Dutch and their enemies, the sailors of Dunkirk, who owned allegiance to Spain, treated English harbours as if they were no-man's-land. Whitelock gave the following description of the causes which led to the levying of Ship-money in England. "Our coasts were much infested by Pyrats, even by Turks and Algiers men, to the great prejudice of trade. The Dutchmen became almost Masters of the Sea in the Northern fishing; Overtures were made concerning Herring fishing, and Busses, for our own Coasts: and to prevent Strangers. . . . The King finding the Controversie begun, and that it must be maintained by force, which his want of money could not doe. . . . And by advice of his Privy Council, and Council Learned the King requires Shipmoney." For assertion of the King's forest rights, the use of patents to bring in a revenue to the Crown, and the levying of Ship-money Laud was not primarily responsible. The forest claims and the writs for Ship-money began when Laud was Bishop of London, and the Earl of Portland Lord Treasurer. Portland was at heart a Catholic, and he and his Catholic friends enriched themselves as well as the Crown.

Laud vigorously attacked Portland's corrupt administration. When Portland died in 1434, soon after Laud became Archbishop of Canterbury, the treasury was put into commission. The new Archbishop was made a commissioner of the treasury, and also head of the Committee for Foreign Affairs. He was thus able to exert a great influence over the policy of England. At first he was hampered by colleagues in the treasury who wished to tread in Portland's steps; but, in 1636, Juxon, who to Laud's joy had succeeded him in the see of London, was appointed Lord Treasurer because "his honesty was beyond dispute." Laud in England and Wentworth in Ireland were making "Thorough" a complete success when storm clouds gathered in Scotland, where the King's servants were feebler and less efficient men.

# CHAPTER XXV

## THE POLICY OF ARCHBISHOP LAUD

### 1633–1639

LAUD'S policy aimed at increasing the power of the Crown and giving it the whole-hearted support of a national Church to which all Englishmen were to conform. He tried to make the law supreme over the rich as well as over the poor, and naturally invoked the aid of the Court of Star-Chamber, which had been created in the reign of Henry VII. to curb the lawless nobility, and of the Court of High Commission, which Parliament established in Elizabeth's reign to enforce religious unity and morality by punishing offenders who had ceased to fear the discipline of a Church weakened by the Reformation. Such a policy was certain to excite violent opposition. In many respects it resembled that of the great French minister, Cardinal Richelieu. But whilst Richelieu struck fiercely and effectively at the French nobles who opposed the King, the executioner's axe was not used by Laud. In England there was no royal army to establish tyranny had Laud wished to make his King despotic.

Until Strafford was murdered by the Long Parliament, only one man was executed for politics or religion during Charles' reign. This victim, a Catholic priest,

was sent to the gallows by the over-zeal of a Puritan judge. Several old women, however, were put to death owing to the belief in witchcraft which was a feature of puritanism in England, Scotland, and the Puritan Colonies. Laud and his bishops discouraged this superstition and were instrumental in saving the lives of some so-called witches. After Laud's fall, from 1640 until the Restoration in 1660, thousands of old people were executed for the crime of witchcraft. Four members of the Puritan party, which persistently demanded the execution of Catholics, figure as the chief of Laud's victims. They were punished for publishing seditious pamphlets of the most extravagant character, and for obstinately glorying in their offences. Three lost their ears in the pillory, one was flogged, and all were imprisoned.

Clarendon states that there would have been little or no sympathy with Bastwick, Burton, and Prynne but for their position in society. One was a doctor, another a divine, and the third a lawyer. When professional men were punished " (as the poorest and most mechanic malefactors used to be, when they were not able to redeem themselves by any fine for their trespasses, or to satisfy any damages for the scandals they had raised against the good name and reputation of others) men began no more to consider their manners but the men, and each profession, with anger and indignation enough, thought their education and degrees and quality would have secured them from such infamous judgments, and treasured up wrath for the time to come." Two of these sufferers played a prominent part in the Civil War, and learned

some wisdom. In 1649, when resisting the establishment of Cromwell's tyranny, Lilburne, who had been flogged and imprisoned under Charles, said "that if it were possible for me now to choose, I had rather choose to live seven years under old King Charles' government (notwithstanding their beheading him as a tyrant for it) when it was at its worst before this Parliament, than live one year under their government that now rule." Ten years later Prynne was taking an active part in the restoration of monarchy in England.

In 1630 a Scotch minister, who had taken a medical degree in Leyden, but had failed to satisfy the examiners of the English College of Physicians, was practising clandestinely and at the same time writing seditious books. His book, called "An Appeal to Parliament; or Sion's Plea against Prelacy," is an excellent illustration of the manner in which religion was used to cloak incitement to rebellion and murder. In "Sion's Plea" the assassination of Buckingham, which was still fresh in men's minds, was represented as the work of "the Lord of Hosts." The Queen was described as a "daughter of Heth" whom the King had married when "he missed an Egyptian." Every evil was attributed to the bishops, and the people were urged to rise in armed rebellion against the government of the King. For less violent language men had been hanged in Elizabeth's reign. To follow up the murder of a Prime Minister by the publication of such a book would be regarded as a serious crime in modern England. That Leighton only suffered the loss of an ear, flogging, and imprisonment illustrates the

clemency, not the severity, of Charles' government. When the King's government was overthrown all these seditious writers were compensated by the Long Parliament, whilst Charles' servants were treated with an illegal severity which reminds the reader of the Merciless Parliament.

To put the royal finances in order was Laud's constant aim. Under Portland the King's debts were continually increasing. Large sums might have been obtained from the forest claims; but as there was no royal army, it was thought wise to abstain from extreme measures against the nobles, and the royal claims were abandoned in return for a small sum. The laws which forbade depopulation by the conversion of arable land into pasture were being broken. A commission was appointed to consider this abuse, and offenders were fined. Clarendon wrote of this part of Laud's policy: "The revenue of too many of the Court consisted principally in inclosures and improvements of that nature which he" (Laud) "still opposed passionately except they were founded upon law; and, then, if it would bring profit to the King, how old and obsolete soever the law was, he thought he might justly advise the prosecution. And so he did a little too much countenance the commission concerning depopulation, which brought much charge and trouble upon the people, and was likewise cast upon his account." Here those who were depopulating the land are called "the people." Clarendon had little sympathy with the poor who were being driven from their homes.

Laud's agrarian policy made enemies amongst the

Royalist courtiers as well as amongst the parliamentarians. The same result followed from his commercial policy. Portland had pleased his Catholic friends by giving them the patent for manufacturing soap from home-grown materials. Laud approved of encouraging home production, whilst he wished to see the patent worked by London manufacturers instead of by Catholic courtiers. After a long contest, Laud achieved his aim, but gained little goodwill, since the patent was assigned to the new company subject to a large annual payment to the Crown. Even the King's wishes were opposed by Laud when they conflicted with the welfare of the nation. Charles loved innocent pleasures, which were nevertheless expensive. In his palaces he collected art treasures, and he inclosed Richmond Park at a great cost, in spite of Laud's loudly expressed fear that his master would lose the hearts of his people by inclosing land. The word " people " is here used in the modern sense.

Notwithstanding the King's extravagance, Laud's financial administration was most successful. The royal debts were diminished, and "Thorough" bid fair to have as great a triumph in England as in Ireland. Clarendon ends his account of Laud's work by telling of how, from the time of his succeeding to the Treasury, Laud " exceedingly provoked or underwent the envy and reproach and malice of men of all qualities, who agreed in nothing else; all which though well enough known to him, were not enough considered by him, who believed, as most men did, the government to be so firmly settled that it could neither be shaken from within nor without, and that

less than a general confusion of Law and Gospel could not hurt him, which was true too; but he did not foresee how easily that confusion might be brought to pass, as it proved shortly to be. And with this general observation of the outward visible prosperity, and the inward reserved disposition of the people to murmur and unquietness, we conclude this first book."

Nothing contributed more towards Laud's ultimate failure than his determination to punish the "most splendid transgressors . . . who were not careful to cover their own iniquities, thinking they were above the reach of other men or their power or will to chastise. Persons of honour and great quality, of the Court and of the country, were every day cited into the High Commission Court upon the fame of their incontinence or other scandal in their lives, and were there prosecuted to their shame and punishment, and as the shame (which they called an insolent triumph upon their degree and quality and levelling them with the common people) was never forgotten, but watched for revenge, so the fines imposed there were the more questioned and repined against, because they were assigned to the rebuilding and repairing St. Paul's Church, and thought therefore to be the more severely imposed and the less compassionately reduced and excused, which likewise made the jurisdiction and rigour of the Star Chamber more felt, and murmured against, and sharpened many men's humours against the Bishops before they had any ill intention towards the Church."

The story of the drainage of the Cambridgeshire

fens throws much light upon some of the causes of the Civil War. In 1629 a Dutchman, called Vermuyden, obtained the contract for a great drainage scheme. He was to receive as payment 95,000 acres of the reclaimed land. An outcry against this grant to a foreigner led to the transfer of the contract in 1635 to the Earl of Bedford, who agreed that the Crown should have 12,000 of the 95,000 acres. Vermuyden was employed to drain the lands as the servant of the company which Bedford formed. In 1638 commissioners at St. Ives incorrectly found that the lands had been drained, and gave the 95,000 acres to Bedford without reserving the 12,000 acres for the Crown. A new commission sat at Huntingdon in 1639. It was then admitted that the land was not drained, and that the money of the company was exhausted. The company was called upon either to raise fresh capital and finish the drainage or to surrender the contract to the King in return for 40,000 acres.

Many poor folk lived by catching wild-fowl in the fens or making baskets from the osiers and reeds. These men looked upon the fens as common lands and the drainage as a great inclosure. There was much opposition in Cambridge, and Cromwell became popular by advocating the claims of the fen-men. His friends have maintained that he also opposed the commissioners who sat at Huntingdon, but this is uncertain. In any case he sat for Cambridge in the Short and in the Long Parliaments, winning for himself the nickname "Lord of the Fens." The Civil War for a time put an end to the drainage; the

scheme was, however, revived during the Commonwealth, and Cromwell's supporters had their reward. But it will be seen that those who gained were not the poor fen-men.

After the suppression of the English religious orders, who for centuries had superintended the production of fine wool, the quality of English wool deteriorated. In 1560 English wool was still the finest, but Spanish wool had become worthy of being called fine. In 1604 James I. prohibited the exportation of English wool to ensure an ample supply for English weavers. It is interesting to notice that about the same time the importation of foreign hops was forbidden, so that English hop-growing, which began in Elizabeth's reign, might be protected from cheap and inferior foreign hops which were flooding the English market.

The immigration of weavers from Flanders and Brabant established a vigorous cloth-making industry in the Dutch Republic, and the manufacture of cloth was being rapidly developed in France under Richelieu's fostering care. There is much to be said in favour of the policy of peace with Spain which was a feature of the reigns of James I. and Charles I. The market of Spain was opened to the English, and through Spain an indirect entrance into her colonial markets was gained. The fine wool of Spain could also be obtained for English looms; and when the English procured a supply of native alum they were able to declare commercial war against the Dutch cloth finishers, notwithstanding the handicap which the Dutch enjoyed in their shipping and control over markets in Brazil and the East.

In 1622 James I. appointed a commission to inquire into the causes of the depreciation of English wool and to suggest methods by which Scotch and Irish wool might be attracted to England. In 1634 Spanish cloth is mentioned as an established industry in England. In 1611 Spanish folly reached its climax when the Moriscos, an industrious people of mixed Spanish and Moorish descent, were expelled from Spain. After their expulsion Spain practically ceased to weave, and Spanish wool was forced to find a market in England, France, or Holland. The long Anglo-Spanish peace facilitated trade between England and Spain. Even war could not wholly prevent the exportation of Spanish wool to France and Holland.

The Thirty Years' War had a disastrous effect upon German production, and Germans bought instead of selling cloth. Dunkirk was the only seaport in the Spanish Netherlands which remained open in spite of the efforts of the Dutch. Through Dunkirk English cloth could find its way into Belgium and Germany. Just before Portland's death the character of the Thirty Years' War changed. France became the open, instead of the secret, enemy of Spain. Arrangements were being made to divide the Spanish Netherlands between France and Holland, thus closing Dunkirk and inflicting a serious blow to the export trade of England. This danger, as well as the desire of freeing the English coasts from Dutch fishermen, influenced Charles' advisers when they recommended the levying of ship money. There was no doubt that the King had the right to demand ship money from the coast towns. The judges held that inland towns, whose

industry and trade were threatened, were also liable; but this judgment was passively resisted by the opponents of the King.

A proposed alliance with Spain for the defence of Dunkirk was defeated by the arguments of Laud and Wentworth. They held that, if England built an adequate navy, she could without war preserve Dunkirk from the Dutch and French. The wisdom of this policy was proved when France in 1635 declared war against Spain and directed her attack against Alsace instead of Belgium. Ship money was honestly devoted to the purpose for which it was levied. A strong fleet soon gave England command of the narrow seas. The claim of the Dutch to fish in English waters was successfully contested, although an English fishing company started by Charles failed owing to the ignorance of the English. Of this De Witt wrote: "In the meantime the *English* challenged the Sovereignty of the narrow Seas, alledging, That the fishery belong'd solely to them. But their intestine Divisions, and not our Sea Forces, put a stop to that work, and their Herring-fishing, then newly begun, ceased. It is observable that when they had taken their Herring at one and the same time and place with the *Hollanders*, and sent them to *Dantzick* in the years 1637 and 1638, and found that the Herring taken and cured by the *Hollanders* was approved and good, and that the *English* Herring to the very last Barrel were esteemed naught; they then chang'd their Claim upon the whole Fishery, into that of having the Tenth Herring, which the diligent and frugal Inhabitants of *Holland* reputed no less than to fish for, and

pay Tribute to a slothful and prodigal People, for a Passage by the Coast of *England*, which yet must have been paid had not the free Government of the States of *Holland*, in the year 1667, brought those Maritime Affairs into another State and Condition."

The pirates from the Mediterranean were driven from the English seas, and an English fleet appeared before Sallee, their seaport, and obtained the surrender of Christian slaves. Whilst all seemed well with England and England's King, storm clouds gathered in Scotland. This kingdom was regarded as so unimportant that Clarendon could write that "the truth is, there was so little curiosity either in the Court or the country to know anything of Scotland, or what was done there, that when the whole nation was solicitous to know what passed weekly in Germany and Poland, and all other parts of Europe, no man ever enquired what was doing in Scotland, nor had that kingdom place or mention in one page of any gazette; and even after the advertisement of the preamble to rebellion, no mention was made of it at the Council Board, but such a dispatch made into Scotland upon it, as expressed the King's dislike and displeasure, and obliged the Lords of the Council there to appear more vigorously in the vindication of his authority and suppression of those tumults."

The mistake made by the English Parliament when it rejected the scheme proposed by James I. for the political and economic union of Great Britain was about to plunge the British Isles in the horrors of civil war. Whilst English industry and commerce made rapid strides, Scotland remained in a com-

paratively unprogressive condition. The English traveller was struck by the filth and squalor of Edinburgh, whilst even the English inns were palaces to the Scotch when they first saw them. Prisoners were still tortured in Scotland, and the burning of witches was almost a national pastime. This cruel form of superstition was closely associated with presbyterianism. It flourished in the New England Colonies when the preachers had realised their ideal and established a theocratic government. During the second half of the sixteenth century thousands of men and women were put to death in Scotland, where the preachers were able to spread terror amongst the people much as witch doctors still do in Africa. The comparatively weak hold which this superstition had over the English was much increased by James I., who carried with him from Scotland a firm belief in the devil's power. Laud tried with some success to mitigate the horrors of witch-hunting. When he fell the witch doctors of England had their way, and under the presbyterian Long Parliament the number of victims in England became a national disgrace. It is to Cromwell's credit that he discouraged this superstition, which gradually died away after the restoration of monarchy.

As a substitute for the political and economic union of England and Scotland which the English Parliament had shelved Laud tried to unite Great Britain by a common ritual. In 1638 an attempt to replace the political prayers of the Scotch preachers by a liturgy kindled a revolt. The liturgy was accompanied by canons which would have com-

pelled the childless Scotch clergy to leave a portion of their estates to educational purposes. At once Scotch nobles who trembled for their church land and Scotch preachers united with the people of Scotland in opposing what seemed to be English dictation. The sentimental tie of the Crown proved ineffective. A Covenant was extensively signed which bound the Covenanters to resist the ecclesiastical innovations and to abolish episcopacy. A General Assembly of the preachers and their lay supporters met at Glasgow in 1638. The Scotch bishops were excommunicated, and under this rebellious theocratic government taxes were levied and the Covenanters took arms. The Scotch universities were placed under control as centres which might be dangerous to the Covenant. Thus Charles was forced either to take action or to lose all authority over his northern kingdom.

Without an army Charles could only oppose the Scotch by calling upon his English magnates to join him with their feudal levies. The fleet was sent north to separate the Scotch from the Dutch and the French from whom they were obtaining military supplies and with whom they were entering into treasonable relations. Had the magnates been loyal the rebels would have been crushed, but there were some who, smarting under the rule of Laud, saw in the Scotch rebellion only an opportunity of weakening the power of the Crown and regaining their old privileges. Although the English magnates were not as yet ready to openly oppose their King, their disaffection caused delay. The funds which had been collected under the care of Laud were exhausted, and poverty

compelled Charles to make terms with the Scotch. The treaty of Berwick was regarded by the Scotch Parliament, which soon met, as a sign of weakness, and they proceeded to pass measures which transferred the royal authority in Scotland from the King to the Scotch Parliament. Charles lost much by this campaign and the treaty of Berwick. His English magnates who were disaffected established secret friendly relations with the Scotch, who, instead of disbanding their forces, took advantage of the peace, imported cannon and military stores from abroad, and attempted to revive the old Franco-Scottish alliance. Impoverished and weakened, Charles was doomed to learn, as his predecessors had done, that there was little pity for a vanquished king.

# XXVI

## KING CHARLES I. AND HIS EARLS

### 1640–1641

WHEN Parliament ruled England in the reign of the Lancastrian Henry VI. the suffrage in the counties was restricted to a limited number of freeholders, and the qualification of a member of Parliament was made prohibitive for all except the moderately wealthy landowner. Before this restriction the packing of Parliaments had been effected by the magnates by means of their retainers; after the War of the Roses the power of the barons was at first so shattered that the danger to the Crown from the existence of two oligarchic houses was not felt. A new body of magnates was, however, created under the Tudors and Stuarts who inherited not only the ancient titles but the old tendency to resent royal interference. These were at first fed sumptuously in the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. from the plunder of the Church, and being well fed, for the most part remained quiet, and co-operated with the Crown in sending to the block those who wished to resist the will of the monarch. The confiscation of abbey lands placed large areas under the control of laymen, who thus were

able to influence the limited number of electors even more effectually than the old feudal barons.

In the reign of Henry VIII. one of the Russells obtained the forest of Exmoor and the town of Tavistock with thirty manors in Devonshire, Cornwall, and Somerset which had belonged to the Abbey of Tavistock. Ten years later, under Edward VI., to these lands were added Thorney, with several thousand acres in Cambridgeshire, the abbey of Woburn in Bedfordshire, and the title Earl of Bedford. The Bedfords were staunch Protestants, and the fourth Earl, he who obtained the contract for draining the fens near his Cambridgeshire lands, was regarded as the leader of the Puritan party. One piece of property which the Bedfords acquired, that near Covent Garden, once Convent Garden, became very valuable during the decade of Charles' personal reign owing to the growth of London; and, although Laud's rule protected the ecclesiastical property and royal rights from spoliation, Bedford and his associates were not treated badly even in the matter of the fens. By the Huntingdon decision they were entitled to receive lands of the annual value of 60,000*l.* in return for a capital outlay of 100,000*l.*, but they had hoped for more.

When Lord Bedford died in 1641 the leadership of the Puritan party devolved upon the Earl of Essex. The first Earl of Essex was created by Queen Elizabeth too late for the plunder of the monasteries. He undertook the planting of Ulster, selling his English estates and receiving grants of Irish lands. He conducted an unsuccessful campaign in Ireland, and

became notorious for his cruelty to the native Irish. After his death in 1576 his son was one of Elizabeth's favourites. The second Earl also failed in Ireland, and this failure and the execution of the Earl for treason have been already described. In 1604 the attainder was removed by Act of Parliament and the traitor's son succeeded to the title. This was the Earl who led the Puritan nobles after Bedford's death. Clarendon describes him as a man who nursed the grievance that his talents were not adequately recognised by the King. His pride was wounded in early life when his wife divorced him and married Somerset, the favourite of James I. The failure of the attack on La Rochelle when Essex was in command seems to have increased the Earl's bitterness. When a favourable moment arrived Essex amply avenged himself on Strafford and the King's advisers who had neglected him.

To Algernon Percy, tenth Earl of Northumberland, more than to any other magnate, Charles owed his ruin. Of Northumberland Clarendon wrote: "If he had thought the King as much above him, as he thought himself above other considerable men, he would have been a good subject; but the extreme undervaluing those, and not enough valuing the King, made him liable to those impressions, which they who approached him by those addresses of reverence and esteem, that usually insinuate into such natures, made in him." He came of a family of Border lords, who looked upon their rank as almost royal and to whom treason appeared to be merely the assertion of their ancient privileges. The first earl was created by Richard II.,

and repaid his benefactor by taking a leading part in the King's deposition and the election of the parliamentary king Henry IV. Before long, however, he was again a rebel, and died fighting against the sovereign he had helped to place on the throne.

Henry V. restored the earldom and estates to the grandson of the first earl, and the second earl and his son who succeeded him fell fighting for the parliamentary kings during the War of the Roses. The son of the third earl swore fealty to the victorious Edward IV. and thus regained the earldom. He fell fighting for Richard III. at Bosworth; but his loyalty was so doubtful that Richard was obliged to place a close watch over him during the battle. His son, the fifth earl, was suspected of using a royal badge when harrying the Scotch, and just before the death of Henry VII. he was fined 10,000*l.* for an encroachment on the King's rights. This earl was, however, never actually guilty of open treason; and his son, the sixth earl, was loyal to Henry VIII., though his brothers and his mother joined in the rebellion called the Pilgrimage of Grace. The sixth earl left no issue, and by the execution of his brother the earldom lapsed. It was, however, revived by Queen Mary in favour of the sons of the Percy who had taken part in the rebellion. These sons engaged in conspiracies against Elizabeth. One was executed as a traitor, and the other committed suicide in the Tower before his trial. The ninth earl, son of the suicide, was found guilty of complicity in Gunpowder Plot, in which one of his kinsmen played a prominent part, and spent nearly sixteen years in the Tower. He died in 1619, and was

succeeded by his son Algernon, who avenged the deaths of his ancestors by largely contributing to the ruin and murder of Charles I.

The difficulty of governing the North of England without the aid of the Percies doubtless prompted England's rulers to forgive their many acts of treason, and the same motive probably had weight with Charles when he showered favours on the tenth earl. Charles made him a Knight of the Garter and Lord High Admiral. Northumberland was thus one of the council who were responsible for the government of England during what is called Charles' personal reign. The campaign against the Scotch which ended with the disastrous treaty of Berwick exhausted the royal treasury, and when the Scotch made use of this treaty to attack the royal authority in Scotland, Charles' fate depended on his being able to raise funds for a new army. Negotiations were pending for a loan from Spain, when a Spanish fleet took refuge in English waters from a superior Dutch force. By what some contemporaries regarded as Northumberland's treachery the Dutch were allowed to attack the Spanish, and Charles was unable to obtain financial relief from Spain. Although Northumberland's subsequent conduct encourages belief in his treachery, neither Charles nor Wentworth, who was recalled to England to advise the King in September 1639, a few weeks before the destruction of the Spanish fleet in the Downs, seems to have doubted Northumberland's loyalty.

To raise funds Wentworth advised the King to summon an English Parliament whilst he returned

to Ireland to obtain a vote of supply from the Irish Parliament. In March 1640 the Irish Parliament granted 180,000*l.* with enthusiasm, and promised to give more if needed. The native Irish were if anything more demonstrative of their loyalty than their English fellow-members. In April the English Parliament, called the Short Parliament, met. Although Charles was able to give proof that the Scotch rebels were negotiating with the French, and although the majority of the peers were anxious to grant supply for the defence of England, the Lower House, led by Pym, began the discussion of grievances. Encouraged by the example of Scotland, the Commons sought practically to abolish the royal power in England as it had been practically abolished in the northern kingdom. After three weeks Charles and his councillors despaired of obtaining supply and the Parliament was dissolved. In the King's Council Northumberland and Holland were alone in wishing to avert a dissolution. As both these Lords ultimately joined the English rebels, it seems probable that this dissolution did not create, though it may have precipitated, the outbreak of civil war.

[NOTE.—At this point the work was interrupted by the death of the author. The two following extracts from his notebook are thought to be of sufficient interest to be added here. It is believed they have not been published among his other writings, and that he intended to use them in this book.]

Historians admit that the wars of the eighteenth century were due to commercial causes, but speak of

earlier wars as wars of religion. The distinction is somewhat misleading. When religion was closely associated with politics and economy, it was natural that it should have occasioned contests between nations. The time has passed when Popes could claim a temporal suzerainty over nations and their rulers. No Pope would now dream of granting lands to a king as Pope Alexander VI. gave the Americas and the East to the kings of Castile and Portugal; nor would any Pope think of issuing an indulgence which, whilst absolving men from mortal sins, failed to absolve from the sin of buying alum from any other source than the mines in papal territory. Religion confines itself within its proper province. Its teachers recognise that its kingdom is not of this world, and thus the economic motive for which men fought, or changed their religion, no longer exists. An attempt has been made in the following pages to trace the economic motive which prompted the wars of religion and the great changes of faith.

. . . . . .

Underlying motive for war, the same at all times. To assert this is not to express any opinion on the character of religion; *e.g.* to say Mahomedanism spread because it relieved Christian provinces from tribute to Byzantium merely gives a reason for the spread of a creed which Protestant Christians believe to be false; whereas showing that the Reformation derived much of its strength from economic causes gives a reason for the spread of a faith which they believe to be superior to the one it superseded.

## ENVOI

### To British Free Traders

Brothers, I come, a spirit from the dead,
To tell the tale of England that I knew;
If you are doubters, pray forgive what's said
In praise of England. You are English, too.

J. W. W.

# LIST OF WORKS CONSULTED

*Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (Rolls Series, 1861. Translation).
*Annales Monastici* (Rolls Series, 1864, &c.).
Ashley's *Economic History*, vol. i. part I, 1888; part II, 1893.

*Bacon* (*Francis, Works of*). Edited by Spedding, Ellis, and Heath.
Bagwell's *Ireland under the Tudors.*
Bancroft's *History of the United States of America.*
Barker's (Ellis) *Rise and Decline of the Netherlands.*
Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiastici.*
*Biographie Universelle.*
Birch's *Cartularium Saxonicum*, A.D. 948–975.
Brewer's *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII.* (Rolls Series).
Bridges' *France under Richelieu and Colbert.*
Bryce's *Holy Roman Empire.*
Burke's *History of Spain.*

Caillet's *Ministère du Cardinal Richelieu.*
*Cambridge Modern History.*
Carlyle's *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches.*
Charlton's *History of Whitby.*
*Chronicle of Jocelin of Brakelond* (King's Classics).
*Chronicles of Stephen, Henry II. and Richard I.* (vol. iii. Rolls Series).
Clowes's *Royal Navy.*
Collings's *Land Reform.*
Cunningham's (T.) *History of Taxes.* (1773.)
Cunningham's (W.) *Growth of English Industry and Commerce, Early and Middle Ages.* (1905.)
Cunningham's (W.) *Growth of English Industry and Commerce, Modern Times.*

De Witt's *True Interest and Political Maxims of the Republic of Holland and West Friesland.* (Translation, 1702.)

*English Church* (*History of*). Edited by Stephens and Hunt.

*Facsimile of Indulgences issued by Pope Leo X.*
Finlay's *History of Greece.*
Fisher's *Forest of Essex.*
Fox Bourne's *English Merchants.*
Freeman's *History of the Norman Conquest.*
Freeman's *General Sketch of European History.*
Froude's *English in Ireland.*
Froude's *History of England.*

Gardiner's *History of England from Accession of James I.* In 10 volumes.
Gardiner's *History of Great Civil War.* In four volumes.
Gardiner's *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution.*
Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.* (Edited by Professor Bury.)
Gniest's *History of English Constitution.* Ashworth's translation.
Gregorovius' *Rome in the Middle Ages.* (Hamilton's Translation.)
Gross' *Gild Merchant.* Vol. 1.
Grote's *History of Greece.*

Hakluyt's *Voyages.*
*Hakluyt's Voyages of Elizabethan Seamen.* Edited by Payne.
Hall's *History of Custom Revenue of English.*
Hodgkin's *Italy and her Invaders.*

Josephus' *Antiquities of the Jews.*

Kervyn de Letterhove's *Histoire de Flandre.*

Lang's *History of Scotland.*
List's *National System of Political Economy.* (Lloyd's Translation.)

Machiavelli's *Prince and other Pieces.* (Morley's.)
Macpherson's *Annals of Commerce.*
Maitland's *Domesday Book and Beyond.*
Milman's *History of the Jews.*
Milman's *History of Latin Christianity.*
Moeller's *History of the Christian Church: Reformation and Counter-Reformation.* (Translated by Freese.)
Morse's *Trade and Administration of the Chinese Empire.*
Motley's *Rise of the Dutch Republic.*

Nares's *Life of Lord Burleigh.*

Pauli's *Simon de Montfort.* (Goodwin's Translation.)
*Political History of England.*

Raleigh's *Select Observations ; presented to King James.*
Rambaud's *Histoire de la Civilisation Française.*
Rishanger's *Chronicle and Miracles of Simon de Montfort.* (Camden Society.)
Rogers's (Thorold) *Economic Interpretation of History.*
Rogers's (Thorold) *History of Agriculture and Prices in England.*

Sharpe's *London and the Kingdom.*
Sinclair's *History of the Revenue.* Third edition.
*Social England.*
Stebbing's *Sir Walter Raleigh.*
Stephens' *Portugal* (*Story of the Nations*).
Strickland's *Lives of the Queens of England.*
Stubbs's *Memorials of St. Dunstan.*
Stubbs's *Constitutional History of England.*
Stubbs's *Select Charters.*

Trollope's *History of the Commonwealth of Florence.*

Varenbergh's *Histoire des Relations Diplomatiques entre la Flandre et l'Angleterre.*
Varenbergh's *La Flandre et l'Empire d'Allemagne.*

Walsingham's *Historia Anglicana.* (Rolls Series.)
*Walter of Hemingburgh.* (English Historical Society.)
Welsford's *Strength of Nations.*
Worm's *Histoire Commerciale de la Ligue Hanséatique.*
Wright's *Political Poems and Songs.* (Rolls Series.)

Young's *Travels during* 1787, 1788, *and* 1789.

# INDEX


ADDLED Parliament, 290
Agincourt, 167
Alcuin, 18, 22–3
Alfred the Great, 24
Aliens, treatment of, 134, 162, 165, 171, 223, 271
Aller, massacre of Saxons at the, 19, 23
Alum, its importance in cloth industry, 187, 211, 216, 217, 223, 247, 275
Alva, Duke of, 251, 254–5
Amboina, massacre at, 277, 292
Amsterdam, 255, 256, 263, 269, 280
Ancient (or Great) Customs, 109, 118, 151
*Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 23, 31
Anglo-Saxon invasion, 8
Anne of Cleves, 234, 237
Anselm, 57, 64–5
Antwerp, 132, 196–7, 203, 222, 224, 246, 248, 249, 255, 256, 257, 267, 269
Arian Christianity, 11, 12, 13
Armada, the, 264
Arras, Peace of, 196, 207
Arthurian legends, 3
Assize of Arms, 77
Avignon, 119, 155

BACON, Francis, Lord Chancellor, 198–9, 202–3, 216, 280, 292
Baldwin, count of Flanders, 26
Baltic trade, 173–5, 180, 194, 204, 240–1
Barbarian invasions of Roman territory, 7, 8, 10, 27
Bates, John, 287
Bath in Roman times, 5
Beaton, Cardinal, 235–6
Beaufort, Cardinal, 178, 182
Beaufort, Edmund, Duke of Somerset, 178, 182–5
Becket, Thomas, Archbp., 72–4
Bedford, John, Duke of, 169, 175, 178
Bedfords enriched by church plunder, 345
Benedictine monasteries, 13, 14, 15, 17, 28, 42–3, 47
Berwick, treaty of, 343
Black Death, 140
Black Sea in Greek legends, 2
Boclands, 30
Boleyn, Anne, 229–31
Bouvines, battle of, 87
Bretigny, treaty of, 144
Brittany, 209–10
Bruce, Robert, 119, 125
Bruges, 131, 134, 166, 170, 190, 196–7
Buckingham, George Villiers, Duke of, 290, 294, 301, 306–311

CADE's rebellion, 178, 183
Cadiz, 264, 268
Cæsar's invasion of Britain, 3
Calais, 139–40, 168, 170, 177, 180, 184, 190, 194, 244
Cambrai, League of, 218

Cambridgeshire Fens, draining of, 335–7
Canada (French), 249, 314–5
Canute, 33–5
Caorsines, 96
Carlyle, Thomas, 1, 288
Carta Mercatoria, *see* Merchants' Charter
Catherine of Aragon, 206–7, 229–30, 232
Cecil, Robert, Earl of Salisbury, 272, 280, 283, 287, 289–90
Cecil, William, Lord Burghley, 243–72
Charles I., 294–349
Charles V., Emperor, 216–7, 219–43
Charles Martel, 17–8
Charles the Bald, 26
Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, 190–4
Charles the Fat, 25
Charles the Great, 18–21, 22–3
Charles the Simple, 26
Chester, battle of, 14
Chichester, Sir Arthur, 299–300
China, 278
Cinque Ports, 45, 112, 174
Cistercians, 50, 69, 83
Civil War, causes of the, 301–15
Clarendon's 'Rebellion' quoted, 331, 333, 334–5, 340, 346
Cloth trade, 151, 171, 176–7, 179, 187–8, 190, 200–1, 203–4, 239, 247–8, 259, 275
Clovis, conversion of, 12–13
Cœur, Jacques, 168
Coinage, 237, 238, 248
Coke, C.J., 288
Cologne, 173, 184, 190, 194
Colonies, foundation of, 291, 293, 297
Columbus, 206, 215
Constantine, Roman Emperor, 4, 6, 10, 12; the forged Donation of, 18, 27
Constantinople, owed its supremacy to Theodosius the Great, 4, and to Constantine, 10, 12; Mahomedan attack upon, repulsed, 17; a commercial metropolis, 20, 21, 34, 82; Emperor's English bodyguard, 40, 48; sacked by Crusaders, 82; captured by Turks, 187
Constitutions of Clarendon, 72
Corn, early legislation about, 186, 240–1
Cotton, 291, 323–4
Court of High Commission, 330, 335
Covenant, Scotch, 342
Cranmer, Archbp., 230, 241, 243
Crecy, 139, 167
Cromwell, Oliver, 311, 336–7, 341
Cromwell, Thomas, 228–34
Customs, Ancient (or Great), 109, 118, 151; New, 118

DAMME, 86, 95
Danegeld, 91
Danelaw, 24
De Burgh, Hubert, 93, 96
De la Pole, Earl of Suffolk, 157–8
De Montfort, Simon, 1st earl, 85, 95; 2nd earl, 96, 100–6, 187
De Witt's 'Interest of Holland,' 180, 262, 269, 339
'Defender of the Faith,' 231
Despensers, the, 127–9
Dominicans, 99
Don John of Austria, 256–7
Donation of Constantine, a forgery, 18, 27
Drake, Sir Francis, 251, 253, 259, 264, 267–8
Dudley and Empson, 216, 219
Dunkirk, 338–9
Dutch East India Company, 277, 292
Dutch Independence, war of, 251–79
Dutch sea-power, growth of, 260–72
Dutch trade rivalry, 273–86
Dutch West India Company, 293

EAST INDIA COMPANY, 277
Easterlings, 44, 121, 123, 124, 241. *See* Hanseatic League
Eastland Company, 249

Edward the Black Prince, 144–7
Edward the Confessor, 35–9
Edward the Martyr, 31
Edward I., 106–20
Edward II., 120–9
Edward III., 129–49
Edward IV., 186–97
Edward V., 197
Edward VI., 237–41
Elbing, 258–9
Elizabeth, Queen, 230, 239, 243–272
Emden, 246, 258, 268
Enclosures, 97, 117, 126, 154, 202, 239, 271, 284–5, 333
Essex, Earl of, 272, 346
Ethelred the Redeless, 31
Eudes, Count of Paris, 25
Evesham, battle of, 106
Evil May Day, 222

FERDINAND and Isabella of Spain, 205–22
Fish trade, 159, 162, 173–4, 327–328, 339
Florence, 166, 171, 187–8, 203–4
Florida, Huguenot colony in, 250–1
Folclands, 30
Forest laws and rights, 92, 120
Francis I., 220–36
Franciscans, 99, 105
Free trade under James I., 276
Frescobaldi, 118, 124
Friars, Dominican and Franciscan, 99, 147
Fuggers, German capitalists, 200, 224–6, 256

GAVESTON, Piers, 122–5
Gavre, battle of, 184
Genoa, 153, 171–2
Ghent, 95, 177, 184
Glastonbury, 30
Gloucester, Humphrey, Duke of, 169, 175–6, 178, 182; Richard, Duke of, *see* Richard III.; Thomas, Duke of, 157–60
Godwine, Earl, 37–9
Good Parliament, 150
Great Charter, 87
Great Contract, 289, 310
Gregory VII. (Hildebrand), 37, 52
Grey, Lady Jane, 241–2
Grossteste, Bishop, 100

HAMBURG, 258
Hanseatic League, 121, 123, 124, 151, 165, 173–5, 179, 180, 181, 183, 193–4, 204, 213, 240–1, 243–4, 246, 248, 258, 268, 270. *See* Steelyard
Harold, 37–40
Harold Bluetooth, 29
Hawkins, Sir John, 250, 268
Heemskerk, Admiral, 279
Hein, Admiral, 293
Henrietta Maria, Queen, 294, 302
Henry I., 59
Henry II., 71–8
Henry III., 89–106
Henry IV., 160–4
Henry V., 164–9
Henry VI., 169–92
Henry VII., 198–218
Henry VIII., 219–37
Henry (IV.) of Navarre, 252, 262, 265, 294, 313
Hildebrand (Pope Gregory VII.), 37, 52
Hops introduced, 271; protected, 337
Howard, Catherine, 237
Huguenots, 245, 250, 262. And *see* La Rochelle
Hundred Years' War, 130
Hungarian invasion of Italy, 27

INDULGENCES, sale of, 225
Iona, 13
Ireland, references to, 72, 75, 126, 157, 160, 161, 211–2, 234–5, 266–7, 279, 291–2, 297, 299–300, 317–8, 321–5, 349
Iron trade, 186, 201, 247
Italy, French invasion of, 211, 218, 219, 221, 223

James I., 254, 262, 266, 272, 273–94
Japan, 278
Jews as international traders, 11, 17, 20, 206, 214, 263; in England, 45, 56, 91
Joan of Arc, 176
John, 75, 80, 81–9
John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, 147, 148, 150, 152, 154, 156–7, 159, 161

Ket's rebellion, 241, 271, 285
Knox, John, 239, 242, 244, 253–4
Kyrkeby, John, 153

La Rochelle, 252, 297, 306, 308, 311, 314. And *see* Huguenots
Labourers, Statutes of, 146–7
Lambe, Dr., 310
Lanfranc, 41, 53, 57
Langton, Stephen, 84, 86, 93
Laud, Archbishop, 321, 325–9, his policy, 330–43
Leicester, Earl of, 262–3, 272
Leighton's 'Sion's Plea,' 332
Levant Company, 248, 291, 304
Lewes, battle of, 104
'Libel of English Policy' (1436–1437), 170–3
Lilburne, 332
Linen, Irish, 291–2, 323–4
Livery and maintenance, 201–2
Lollards, 147, 148, 152, 154, 160, 162
London, references to, 41–2, 45, 56, 69–70, 88, 127–8, 149, 159, 162–3, 182, 184, 185, 191–2, 223, 258, 310, 326–7, 345
Louis IX., 98
Luther, 225

Magnus Intercursus, 213
Mahomedans, their invasion of Europe checked at Tours, 17; invade Southern Italy, 25, 27; capture Constantinople, 187
Malus Intercursus, 213
Manchester, 291, 324
Manwaring's sermon, 309
Marignano, battle of, 221
Marshal, William, Earl of Pembroke, 93
Mary of Burgundy, 194–6, 207
Mary Tudor, Queen, 242–4
Mary, Queen of Scots, 236, 238, 242, 243, 253–5, 262, 265
Maryland, 299
Massachusetts, 298
Maurice of Orange, 263, 281–2
*Mayflower*, 292–3, 298
Medici, the, 187, 200, 223; Catherine de, 250
Merchant Adventurers, 175, 248, 258, 273, 275
Merchants' Charter, 118, 120, 122, 124, 128
Merciless Parliament, 158
Merton, provisions of, 97, 117; statute of, 202
Model Parliament, 115
Monasteries, foundation of, *see* Benedictines, Cistercians; suppression of, 219–32
Monopolies, 274, 276, 304
Montague's pamphlet, 303, 307
Moors (Moriscos), 206, 214, 279–280, 338
More, Sir Thomas, 230–1
Mortmain, statute of, 110
Munster, Plantation of, 266
Muscovy merchants, 249

Naval matters referred to, 24–5, 31, 32–3, 37, 38–9, 40, 86, 134, 146, 151–2, 156, 170, 180, 181, 182, 189, 191, 198, 204, 225, 236, 249, 282, 290, 302, 308, 339
Naval power, increase of, 246–59
Navigation Act, 156, 189
Neville's Cross, 143
Nicholas I., Pope, 27
Nombre de Dios, 253, 255
Norman Conquest, 34–70
Northampton, 153
Northmen, ravages of, 23
Northumberland, Algernon Percy, 10th earl of, 346–9; John Dudley, Duke of, 241–2
Noy, Attorney-General, 319

Octroi, origin of, 11
Odo of Bayeux, 53
Offa, King of Mercia, 22
Ordainers, 124
Otto the Great, 27–9

Papal supremacy repudiated, 233–45
Parliament, first meeting at Westminster, 105
Parma, Alexander of, 256, 264, 265
Parr, Catherine, 237, 239
Pavia, battle of, 227
Peasant proprietors, 240
Peasants' Revolt, 155
Peasants' War (Germany), 226
Peter's Pence, 16, 52
Petition of Right, 309
Philip II., 242–3, 245–68
Philipot, naval treasurer, 152
Pilgrimage of Grace, 232
Poll-tax, 150, 153
Poor rate, 285
Portugal, 69, 79, 156, 188, 205, 206, 207, 216, 224, 250, 257, 267–8, 277, 278, 279
Poynings Acts, 211–12
Prise, levying of, 22
Protection for English trade, early instances of, 42, 44–6, 69, 70, 90, 151, 171, 186–7, 198, 204, 216–7, 258, 337
Protective policy initiated, 193–204
Provisions of Merton, 97, 117; of Oxford, 101; of Westminster, 101
Prynne, 332
Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, 27
Puritanism, rise of, 295

Quo Warranto, statute of, 117

Raleigh, Sir Walter, 272, 275, 283, 291
Reformation in England at first economic rather than religious, 231, 242
Religious contentions, 286–300
Rhode Island, 298
Richard I., 75, 77, 79–81
Richard II., 147–62
Richard III., 196–8
Richard, Earl of Gloucester, 100–4
Richelieu, Cardinal, 313, 314, 330, 337
Richmond Park enclosed, 334
Roberts, Lewes, on Manchester, 291, 323–4
Rolf, Duke of Normandy, 26
Roman Settlement of Britain, 1–7
Rome, sack of, 228

St. Albans, 185, 186
St. Augustine, 13–4
St. Bartholomew Massacre, 252
St. Benedict, 13
St. Berno of Cluny, 28
St. Boniface, 18
St. Columba, 13
St. Dominic, 85, 99
St. Dunstan, 28, 30–2
St. Francis, 99
St. Wilfrid, 15–6
St. Willibrord, 18
Saracenic invasion of Europe, 17, 25, 27
Saxon England, 22–33
Scotland referred to, 75, 111–2, 115–20, 125, 129–30, 143, 144, 175, 189, 195–6, 212–3, 220–1, 235–7, 244–5, 253–4, 265–6, 284, 295–6, 316, 319–320, 340–3
Sea-Beggars, 252, 255
Sea-power, increase of, 246–59
Serfdom, disappearance of, 155
Settlement of Europe, 8–21
Seymour, Jane, 231
Ship-money, 308, 328, 338
Ships and naval stores bought from Germany, 121–2, 172, 249
Short Parliament, 349
Silk, 186, 199
Simnel, Lambert, 209
Six Articles, 234, 239
Slave-trade, 250, 251
Sluys, battles at, (1340) 134, (1387) 158

Somerset, Duke of, Protector, 237–41
Southampton, 153
Spain, 189, 205–18, 219, 224, 228, 234, 242–4, 246–83, 289–294, 306, 337–9, 348
Stade, 259, 268
Star Chamber, 201, 322, 330
States-General of France, 312–4
Statute of Marlborough, 101
Steelyard, 49, 121, 124, 131, 151, 165, 184, 190, 191, 213, 241, 268, 273. *See* Hanseatic League
Stephen of Boulogne, 63, 64, 65–70
Stigand, 39, 41
Strafford, Thomas Wentworth, Lord, 309, 311, 318, 319, 320, 321–5, 348–9
Stratford, John, Archbp., 137–8
Suffolk, William de la Pole, Duke of, 178, 182–3
Sweyn, King of Denmark, 32–3

TEMPLARS, 125
Tetzel, 225
Theodore of Tarsus, 15
Theodosius the Great, 4
Thirty Years' War, 227, 282, 289, 292, 338
Thomas of Lancaster, 125–28
'Thorough,' policy of, 321
Tobacco, 298
Toulouse, 85, 94
Tournay, 220, 223
Tours, battle of, 17
Tunnage and poundage, 303, 307, 312

ULSTER, Plantation of, 279, 291–2, 300
Utrecht, diet at, 183–4, 193, 204

VENICE, 20, 50, 172, 203, 218
Verdun, treaty of, 20, 23
Vills and villeins, Saxon, 9
Virginia Company, 291, 297, 305
Volterra, 187

WALES, 110–1, 114–5, 235
Wallace, William, 116–9
War of the Roses, 179–92
Warbeck, Perkin, 210–2
Warwick, Earl of, 185, 190–1
Weavers, immigrant, 271
Westminster, Council of, 99, 100
Whitby Conference, 14–5
Whitelock's 'Memorials,' 320, 328
Whittington, Rich., Lord Mayor, 160, 162
Widukind, 19
William I., 35–54
William II., 55–9
William of Orange, 251–2, 255–7, 261–2
Winchelsey, Robert of, 114, 119–120, 122, 125
Winchester, statute of, 131
Winwaed, battle of, 14
Wisby, 44, 50, 173
Witchcraft, belief in, 331, 341
Wolsey, Cardinal, 222–30
Wool and cloth trade, 26–7, 43, 60, 63, 75–6, 84, 95, 102–3, 108–10, 112, 130–4, 141, 142, 143, 166, 176, 177, 186–8, 190, 200–1, 203–4, 206, 223, 239, 337
Wulfstan, 41
Wycliffe, John, 147, 148, 150, 152

YEOMAN class, 203
York, Richard, Duke of, 178, 182, 183, 185–6; Edward, Duke of, *see* Edward IV.

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO. LTD., LONDON
COLCHESTER AND ETON

# POLITICAL ECONOMY, ECONOMICS, &c.

By Professor W. J. ASHLEY.

BRITISH INDUSTRIES: a Series of General Reviews for Business Men and Students. By various Authors. Edited by W. J. ASHLEY. Crown 8vo. 5*s.* 6*d.* net.

AN INTRODUCTION TO ENGLISH ECONOMIC HISTORY AND THEORY. Crown 8vo., Part I., The Middle Ages. 5*s.* Part II., The End of the Middle Ages. 10*s.* 6*d.*

THE ADJUSTMENT OF WAGES: a Study in the Coal and Iron Industries of Great Britain and the United States. With 4 Maps. 8vo. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

---

A NEW EDITION OF MILL'S POLITICAL ECONOMY.

THE PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL ECONOMY. By JOHN STUART MILL. Edited by W. J. ASHLEY, M.A., Professor of Commerce in the University of Birmingham. With Index by Miss M. A. ELLIS. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

UNEMPLOYMENT: a Problem of Industry. By W. H. BEVERIDGE, Stowell Civil Law Fellow of University College, Oxford; formerly Sub-Warden of Toynbee Hall. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

SIXTY YEARS OF PROGRESS AND THE NEW FISCAL POLICY. By Lord BRASSEY, K.C.B., D.C.L. 8vo. sewed, 2*s.* 6*d.* net; cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

WORK AND WAGES: in continuation of Lord Brassey's 'Work and Wages' and 'Foreign Work and English Wages.' By SYDNEY J. CHAPMAN, M.A. With an Introduction by Lord BRASSEY, K.C.B., D.C.L., LL.D. Medium 8vo.

Part I. FOREIGN COMPETITION. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Part II. WAGES AND EMPLOYMENT. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

THE COMMONWEAL: a Study of the Federal System of Political Economy. By ALFRED P. HILLIER, B.A., M.D. Crown 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

THE INDUSTRIAL SYSTEM: an Enquiry into Earned and Unearned Incomes. By J. A. HOBSON. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

THE TRUST MOVEMENT IN BRITISH INDUSTRY: a Study of Business Organisation. By HENRY W. MACROSTY, B.A. 8vo. 9*s.* net.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO. 39 Paternoster Row, London;
New York, Bombay, and Calcutta.

# POLITICAL ECONOMY, ECONOMICS, &c.

LECTURES ON THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION OF THE 18TH CENTURY IN ENGLAND. By ARNOLD TOYNBEE. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

*Popular Edition.* With a Reminiscence of the Author by Lord MILNER. Crown 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

INDUSTRIAL EFFICIENCY: a Comparative Study of Industrial Life in England, Germany and America. By ARTHUR SHADWELL, M.A., M.D. Crown 8vo. 6*s.* net.

PRINCIPLES OF ECONOMICS, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO AMERICAN CONDITIONS. By EDWIN R. A. SELIGMAN. With 28 Maps and Charts. Crown 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

---

By SIDNEY and BEATRICE WEBB.

ENGLISH POOR LAW POLICY. Being a detailed analysis of the policy of Parliament and the Local Government Board from 1834 down to the present day, with four supplementary chapters analysing the Majority and Minority Reports.

THE BREAK-UP OF THE POOR LAW: Being Part I. of the Minority Report of the Poor Law Commission. Edited, with Introduction. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

THE PUBLIC ORGANISATION OF THE LABOUR MARKET: Being Part II. of the Minority Report of the Poor Law Commission. Edited, with Introduction. 8vo. 5*s.* net.

THE HISTORY OF TRADE UNIONISM. With Map and Bibliography. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY: a Study in Trade Unionism. 2 vols. 8vo. 12*s.* net.

PROBLEMS OF MODERN INDUSTRY. 8vo. 5*s.* net.

THE HISTORY OF LIQUOR LICENSING IN ENGLAND, PRINCIPALLY FROM 1700 TO 1830. Crown 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

ENGLISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT FROM THE REVOLUTION TO THE MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS ACT. 8vo.

THE PARISH AND THE COUNTY. 16*s.* net.

THE MANOR AND THE BOROUGH. 2 vols. 8vo. 25*s.* net.

LONDON EDUCATION. By SIDNEY WEBB. Crown 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

---

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO. 39 Paternoster Row, London; New York, Bombay, and Calcutta.

00028980

Digitized with financial assistance from

on 10 July, 2018